DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 763 UD 028 386

TITLE Chapter 1 Program Improvement and Innovation across the States: An Overview and Survey Excerpts.

INSTITUTION Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education, Middletown, CT.

PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 100p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; *Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; High Risk Students; Program Descriptions; *Program Improvement; School Districts; State Programs; State Surveys; *Supplementary Education; Urban Areas; Urban Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Hawkins Stafford Act 1988

ABSTRACT

This compilation presents narratives describing Chapter 1 program improvement and innovation efforts across the nation at state and local levels. The survey responses summarized in this report were submitted by State Coordinators of Compensatory Education. Responses were received from 48 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. The United States is now in the second school year of full implementation of the Hawkins Stafford Amendments of 1988. In 1989-90, states and localities had identified 6,300 schools (nearly 12 percent of Chapter 1 schools) as needing improvement. Preliminary data for 1990-91 suggest that close to 9,000 schools may be developing or implementing program improvements. A critical concern has been how to implement improvements with limited funds. Chapter 1 schools are also benefiting from innovation stimulated through Chapter 1 improvement. Narrative summaries for 26 states discuss program improvement and innovation. Such details as the number of schools involved, proportional expenditures, and staff and school objectives are included. Many narratives highlight improvement and innovation in particular cities or school districts. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339763

Chapter 1 Program Improvement and Innovation Across the States

An Overview and Survey Excerpts

compiled by

The Council of Chief State School Officers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tommie Williams
Council of Chief State School Officers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

in conjunction with

The National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education

May 1991

UD 028 386

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Council of Chief State School Officers
379 Hall of the States
400 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-1511
(202) 393-8165

National Association of
State Coordinators of Compensatory Education
25 Industrial Park Road
Middletown, Connecticut 06457
(203) 638-4224

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a nationwide non-profit organization of the 57 public officials who head departments of public education in the fifty states, five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Dependents Schools. It has functioned as an independent national council since 1927 and has maintained a Washington office since 1948.

The CCSSO Office of Federal/State Relations helps the states to advise Congress and government agencies about education issues. Council staff members work closely with chief state school officers, federal liaison representatives, and other state education agency (SEA) staff to improve communications between SEAs and the federal government and strengthen and clarify the state role in federal education legislation.

Council of Chief State School Officers
Herbert J. Grover, (Wisconsin) President
Werner Rogers, (Georgia) President-elect
Gordon M. Ambach, Executive Director

Office of Federal/State Relations
Carnie Hayes, Director
Mark Gittleman, Legislative Associate
Patricia Schmid, Legislative Staff Assistant

The National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education (NASCCE) is an organization of state coordinators, directors, and managers of compensatory education founded in 1972 with the primary goals of providing a vehicle for the exchange of ideas among the various states and serving as the official body representing the general wishes, desires, opinions and needs of the State Coordinators of Compensatory Education.

National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education
Diana Whitelaw (Connecticut), President
Milton Matthews (Mississippi), President-elect

Committee on Program Improvement
Michael J. Hughes (Arizona), Chair
Elaine Takenaka (Hawaii)
Karen Underwood (Idaho)
Ronald E. Friend (Maryland)
Milton D. Matthews (Mississippi)
James M. Sullivan (New York)
William Henry (Ohio)
Robert M. McNamara (Vermont)
Myrna M. Toney (Wisconsin)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW 1

Arizona 5
California 9
Colorado 12
Connecticut 16
Idaho 20
Illinois 23
Indiana 27
Iowa 31
Kansas 34
Kentucky 37
Maryland 41
Massachusetts 44
Michigan 47
Mississippi 51
New Mexico 55
New York 58
North Dakota 62
Ohio 65
Pennsylvania 68
Rhode Island 72
South Carolina 77
Utah 80
Vermont 83
Washington 85
West Virginia 88
Wisconsin 91

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND INNOVATION ACROSS THE STATES: AN OVERVIEW

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education (NASCCE) are pleased to present a compilation of narratives describing Chapter 1 program improvement and innovation efforts across the nation at both the state and local level.

The survey responses included in this report were submitted by State Coordinators of Compensatory Education and compiled by CCSSO Office of Federal/State Relations (OFSR) staff. The survey itself was designed jointly by CCSSO-OFSR and the President and Program Improvement Committee of NASCCE. Responses to the survey were received from 48 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

The nation is now in the second school year of full implementation of the Hawkins-Stafford amendments and program improvement (1990-91). The states are administering program improvement and the new provisions to promote innovation with high expectations. To some extent, the degree of ease or difficulty states encountered in establishing the program improvement process depended on whether or not there was an antecedent program for measuring student progress on a school-by-school basis.

Through the 1989-90 school year, states and localities had identified 6,300 schools (nearly 12% of Chapter 1 schools) as needing improvement. Based on 1990-91 preliminary data, the Department of Education estimates that the number of schools either developing or implementing program improvement plans may now be close to 9,000.

For the first year of implementation, most states adopted the national minimum improvement standard of a Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) gain of greater than zero as the state minimum standard for aggregate student achievement.[1] This caution was based

---

[1] As required by both the statute and the regulations governing program improvement, the standard setting for improvement and identification of schools is a joint state-local endeavor. In the regulations, the U.S. Department of Education defined "no improvement or a decline in aggregate student achievement," the statutory criteria for identifying a school in need of improvement, as zero or less Normal Curve Equivalency (NCEs) gain on standardized tests. The statewide NCE standard, however, is not the only standard that LEAs must use to identify schools for improvement; the statute and regulations specify that local applications must state the "desired outcomes" for Chapter 1 projects and identify as needing improvement any school not making "substantial progress" toward these outcomes.

on states' inability to project how many schools would be identified as needing improvement and the limited resources with which to assist them ($5.7 million). Now that the program is underway and funding has increased, a number of states are raising standards for improvement by requiring higher NCE gains on standardized tests and greater progress in achieving locally-determined outcomes such as higher grades, reductions in grade retention and increased attendance. Some states, in which there is resistance to higher statewide standards, have succeeded in encouraging local education agencies (LEAs) to adopt higher standards on a district-by-district basis.

Importance of Program Improvement

CCSSO strongly supported authorization of provisions for program improvement in the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments, and we support their implementation, full funding and expansion for these reasons:

- The provisions put the emphasis of Chapter 1 on student performance on a school-by-school basis.

- Program improvement provides a positive, ongoing accountability system for the largest federal elementary and secondary education program. Schools identified as needing improvement are targeted for special attention and tangible assistance from the local district and the state to assure that student performance improves.

- Program improvement identifies the schools most in need of assistance, enabling state and local education agencies to bring promising practices to those schools, and in turn raise expectations and performance at schools across the entire school district.

- Program improvement draws the state and localities together in a joint endeavor toward effective performance. It enables each state, local district and school to set goals and assess progress for America's educationally disadvantaged students.

Concerns

The most significant concern for the 1990-91 school year has been how to adequately assist schools identified as needing improvement with only $12.5 million, which averages less than $2,000 per school. States document the need for substantially greater resources to provide technical assistance to the increasing numbers of schools identified through the use of higher standards and more sophisticated assessment techniques.

Of almost equal concern to state education agencies (SEAs) and their Committees of Practitioners are the restrictions on their use of program improvement funds to respond to local requests for state technical assistance. This is due to an interpretation of the law by the U.S. Department of Education that no program improvement funds may be used for technical assistance by SEA personnel, regional labs and centers, institutions of higher

education or any other state or local providers unless the source is specifically approved in the LEA school plan for improvement. The varying timetables and strategies of local improvement plans preclude the efficiency and effectiveness of coordinating and providing technical assistance on a more regional or statewide basis.

SEAs have had to divert funds for state administration not only to do the administrative activities associated with program improvement, but also to provide technical assistance to those schools. The shift of funds and state staff time to program improvement has reduced time and resource devoted to other Chapter 1 administrative functions such as compliance monitoring and the provision of technical assistance to schools other than those requiring improvement.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

Chapter 1 schools, and in many cases whole school districts and state education systems, are benefitting from the innovation stimulated through Chapter 1 program improvement. In addition, provisions in the Hawkins/Stafford Amendments for flexibility in the use of Chapter 1 funds are helping schools, particularly those with exceptionally high concentrations of disadvantaged students, to restructure learning and teaching throughout the school.

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has provided an additional impetus and support for the coordination of services statewide in the areas of curriculum development, teacher preparation, assessment, bilingual education, early childhood education and special education. Chapter 1 program improvement is also helping states better coordinate federal programs around the improvement model by targeting other federal funds such as Chapter 2 and Eisenhower math and science funds to schools undergoing improvement. Chapter 1 is playing an integral role in statewide school improvement efforts and has also become part of a better coordinated early childhood and education intervention strategy in a number of states.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 program improvement has put "teeth" into the Chapter 1 coordination requirements so that there is more dialogue between Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers, more sharing of ideas and strategies, and more curriculum coordination. Program improvement accountability by school has garnered active involvement of school principals in the improvement process, which is benefitting entire schools. There is generally a more positive view of Chapter 1 schoolwide because of greater coordination.

The focus on "outcomes" through performance assessments is also causing teachers to change the manner in which they deliver all of their instruction. In addition, the focus on

advanced skills is resulting in a new look at all curriculum in terms of fostering higher order thinking as well as basic skills. Chapter 1 program improvement has also helped pave the way for state school improvement efforts by reducing the stigma of identification based on inadequate performance and by providing technical assistance for improvement.

Schoolwide Projects

Through schoolwide use of Chapter 1 funds, participating schools have been able to reorganize their learning and instruction to better serve all students. Schoolwide projects provide the flexibility to implement a greater variety of educational strategies such as building on the effective schools model and promising practices such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring. Schoolwide projects are allowing for greater collaboration and coordination of instruction and support services schoolwide.

Use of the 5% Innovation Option

Chapter 1 funds are being used by some districts under the 5% innovation option for the following types of activities: continuation of services to Chapter 1 children receiving services in any preceding year; training of teachers with respect to the special needs of Chapter 1 children; expansion or establishment of innovative parent involvement programs; reading and book incentives; support for peer tutoring; various higher order learning activities; and the provision of continued Chapter 1 services to eligible children transferred to ineligible schools.

The relatively low number of schools choosing to use 5% of their basic grant for innovation is mainly due to: the lack of adequate funds in the regular Chapter 1 program; the inadequacy of the 5% funds to initiate innovation projects of substantial size and scope; the allowable use of regular Chapter 1 funds for innovation without conducting an "innovation" project; and the narrow range of activities listed in the statute for which 5% innovation funds can be used.

ARIZONA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Arizona, 102 out of 525 Chapter 1 schools are involved in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. A total of 4 joint SEA/LEA plans have been undertaken with program improvement schools.

The current statewide standard for improvement in the state is a minimum gain of one NCE, although by 1992, the SEA expects to increase the minimum standard to two NCEs. Arizona has 49 LEAs with schools identified for program improvement which have locally-determined aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard. Sixty-three schools identified for program improvement listed aggregate achievement as their sole desired outcome. Thirty-two schools were selected on both aggregate achievement and desired outcomes, and 7 were selected solely on desired outcomes.

Approximately 66% of program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes SEA workshops on program planning, research and evaluation, and individual school consultation.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA held special workshops and meetings for coordinators and designated administrative staff.

Approximately 20% of state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. As a result of this increased attention, general technical assistance and monitoring have been cut back and there has been a delay in the automation of office procedures.

There are several federal restrictions which slow or prohibit expenditure of program improvement funds at the state level. The practice of requiring school staff and community approval prior to expenditure of funds delays funds going to LEAs. In addition, because program improvement grants are discretionary funds, State Board of Education approval of each grant and expenditure must be obtained, thus limiting the number of LEA applications.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Arizona Department of Education would increase mini-grants, organize a mentor program, and improve dissemination using National Diffusion Network (NDN) programs.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Killip School

Killip School in Flagstaff, Arizona is located in an area that has a large number of low income families (77%). The school serves a diverse ethnic population of Hispanic, Native American, and Anglo students.

Prior to program improvement, Killip School demonstrated the lowest performance of all schools in the district. The Chapter 1 program consisted of a central office planned project in which two reading specialists served approximately 100 participants in a limited pullout model. However, the program did not address two dominant needs: large numbers of eligible but unserved children and student mobility. The principal used program improvement to institute a site-based schoolwide project which included a number of interventions, close coordination with regular instruction, and collaboration with other community resources.

After being identified for program improvement, the school undertook an extensive needs assessment process. Staff participated in a series of state-sponsored workshops on needs assessment, exemplary practices, and current research. Surveys were sent to Killip parents, of whom 67% responded, and staff. In addition, tests and other pertinent data were reviewed by the leadership team and faculty. The following needs were identified: language development; curriculum alignment; parental involvement; reduced class size in the primary grades; strengthening of the academic program in all subject areas; staff development; and school-parent partnership programs.

These concerns were addressed by restructuring many of the instructional and support activities. After a number of meetings of the school improvement team and staff, the following changes were made in the Chapter 1 program: pre-kindergarten classes were formed; a pre-first grade class was created; class size in grades 1-3 was reduced; and ongoing staff training took place in language development, curriculum alignment and professional competencies.

In addition, Killip's principal and school improvement team have been able to access resources outside those which are normally available in the district. For example, a federal grant for parent involvement was obtained. The school hired a parent coordinator who, with the assistance of two parents, defined the parents' responsibility and role in their child's education.

The school also arranged with Northern Arizona University for undergraduate student volunteers to act as paraprofessionals in the classroom. The principal has assumed an active role by involving herself in community affairs as an advocate for Killip School. The school established a much closer relationship with preschool and the neighborhood Headstart program.

An exciting atmosphere now permeates the school. Parents feel welcome in the school and students are excited about learning. Staff collaboration focuses on students' academic and health needs. Decisions regarding instruction are made at meetings in which both staff members and parents are invited to contribute their ideas about what is good for Killip students. The Killip staff and the Flagstaff central office staff have noticed a significant change in both the climate of the school and, more importantly, in the performance of the students.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff by using a state-funded School Improvement Unit (SIU) which is comprised of special project and curriculum specialists and uses curriculum, special projects and assessment specialists to mentor staff in program improvement. Schools identified for program improvement will be given priority in assistance from SIU specialists.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The SEA has stressed that program improvement efforts should be conducted and/or subsumed under school restructuring activities. Schools are advised that evaluation of all services involving the Chapter 1 participant must be conducted, rather than a fragmented needs assessment approach. The SEA has also found that school staff in program improvement conduct more thorough needs assessment, are eager to study the most current research and evaluation procedures, and work seriously toward program coordination.

Use of the 5% Option

In Arizona, six LEAs have implemented projects with the 5% grant for innovation, a majority of which are parent involvement programs and teacher inservice. More LEAs have not taken advantage of the 5% because many of the innovative type projects can be funded through traditional Chapter 1 programs, and because use of 5% funds is limited by budget constraints and previous funding commitments.

Schoolwide Projects

Several of Arizona's schoolwide projects have used the opportunity to restructure and make significant changes relative to the educational programs provided to at-risk students. Mountain View Elementary School in the Washington School District, Phoenix, Arizona, created a strong integrated language curriculum and trained instructors to employ more holistic methods of teaching reading and writing skills. The schoolwide project included

extensive after-school and Saturday school programs which provided activities such as "Storytime", "Writers Workshop", and "The Newspaper Club".

Another example of an effective schoolwide project is Butler Elementary School in the Isaac School District. Chapter 1 funds were used to develop an intensive parent education intervention program where Chapter 1 families were provided services by a parent liaison and a family counselor. Education and training classes were offered to parents to help them attain their GED, learn English, and better assist their children with their studies.

Ganado Primary School in Ganado, Arizona, and Liberty School in Sunnyside School District, Tucson, Arizona, have each operated very successful schoolwide projects for over four years. Both demonstrate schoolwide success by using the provision of ongoing school restructuring. In fact, Ganado has been recognized nationally for its efforts. Ganado has emphasized a "meaning-based curriculum" approach in which a curriculum specialist/master teacher is responsible for ensuring continued teacher inservice and articulation with the upper grade schools. Liberty school initiated an Outcomes-Based Education Model which changed school hours and emphasized flexible groupings.

CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In California there are 301 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The California State Department of Education has undertaken 212 joint plans with program improvement schools.

California has three measures to be used by the LEAs in the identification of schools for program improvement. They are: norm-referenced tests, the California Assessment Program, and other measures developed by the districts. The standard for the norm-referenced tests is that the pre-post changes in norm scores should be positive for compensatory education students. The standard for the California Assessment Program (CAP), a matrix sampling test, is based on making substantial progress toward meeting desired outcomes. The schools can either meet the state target for growth, set by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and reported in the performance report of the school, or demonstrate grade-level performance.

The standard for other measures may be set by the LEAs as long as the (a) student improvement is greater than would be expected without the compensatory education services, and (b) students are achieving desired outcomes.

All of California's program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to the LEAs. One-hundred percent of the 1989 and 96% of the 1990 funds have been distributed to the LEAs for the schools with Program Improvement Action Plans (PIAPs) on file with the SEA.

The California State Department of Education uses three delivery services for program improvement. One is a private consulting firm; another is a Department initiative; and the third is the use of a Compensatory Education Office regional configuration developed for local needs. All three entities have commonalities. They include: a process for analyzing data to determine improvement needs; a systematic planning process for the three-year PIAP; review and comment on the plan; and resources to assist the schools in implementing the appropriate improvement activities. All action plans are read and commented on by SEA staff, and technical assistance is provided by only one of the service entities. During the training for the new schools on planning and subsequent implementation activities, emphasis is placed on curriculum, instruction, assessment, staff development, parent involvement, and school climate.

Program assistance is provided to all identified schools through the Regional Steering Committees. These groups meet, at a minimum, four times a year in their geographical area. The meetings are facilitated by Compensatory Education Office (CEO) consultants

and attended by the Principal, member of the Leadership Team, and a district representative. The purpose of the meetings are: 1) to organize the geographical regions of the state and promote the coordination of local resources; 2) to assist with the development of the PIAP; 3) to promote the curriculum improvement through statewide summer institutes and follow-up sessions; and 4) to provide SEA information that is appropriate to the improvement process of all schools. In addition, two statewide conferences are held, annually, in the Fall and Spring. The Fall conference is for new program improvement schools that are beginning implementation of plans so they can become aware of the resources connected with the regional structure, and the Spring conference is for "Achieving Compensatory Education" schools to showcase their effective practices, and be exposed to national and state speakers and presenters who will discuss the latest educational techniques for meeting the needs of compensatory education students. The Regional Steering Committees have representatives from organized curriculum groups, the rural and regular Technical Assistance Centers, county and district Chapter 1 coordinators, and CEO staff.

In addition to providing technical assistance to program improvement schools, the regional and statewide meetings help to dispel negative attitudes often associated with the identification of schools for improvement by emphasizing the benefits of being accountable to compensatory education students and the benefits of effective strategies for school change.

Approximately 75% of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. With increases in funding, the State Department of Education would: provide more technical assistance for developing instructional strategies for compensatory education students in the classroom; identify and organize alternative assessment techniques for classroom teachers to use in determining the academic progress of identified students; and assist with the coordination and access of resources to meet the needs of the program improvement schools.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. SEA efforts to foster collaboration include: quarterly meetings with SEA staff in curriculum development, teacher preparation, assessment, bilingual education, early childhood education and special education; and coordination with these staff in developing reading plans, visiting sites, and presenting at conferences.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The leveraging of Chapter 1 program improvement has allowed the SEA to review the regular program and make sure compensatory education students have access to a rich and quality core curriculum. The provisions of parent involvement are responsible for state legislation that implements the Chapter 1 law for parents and allows state funds to be withheld when a district does not comply. Finally, efforts to seek alternative assessment practices for compensatory education students are underway because of Chapter 1.

Use of the 5% Option

In 1990-1991, 65 LEAs were approved to implement innovation projects. Most of the activities funded are in staff development and parent involvement.

Westfield Village Elementary Schoolwide Project, West Sacramento

The Westfield Village schoolwide project began with a comprehensive assessment of the total academic program at the site. Specific criteria were developed for each curricular area. The data used was from two norm referenced tests, a statewide matrix sampling test, and the state proficiency test results. Based on that review, the goals for the schoolwide project were set and priorities ordered. The state law for School-Based Coordinated Programs, along with the provision of Chapter 1 schoolwide projects allow a coordinated approach for restructuring the entire program at the school site as was done at Westfield Village.

A Leadership Team composed of teachers, administrators, and parents developed the final comprehensive plan including the selection of curricular areas in language arts and mathematics that meet the needs of all students. The changes in the curriculum were brought about by intensive, ongoing staff development and a productive parent involvement program. Finally, the SEA has promoted the use of various instructional strategies to meet the needs of compensatory education students so they can have access to a rich core curriculum.

The leadership of the principal at this school was instrumental in implementing the schoolwide project. The SEA arranged for the principal to share her experience with the Committee of Practitioners. She has also been asked by the largest LEA in the state to assist in the development of 89 new schoolwide projects.

COLORADO

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Colorado there are 142 schools in the program improvement process. Spring 1991 evaluation results will determine the need for joint program improvement plans with the Colorado Department of Education.

The current statewide minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state is 1 NCE gain. Fifty-five out of 66 LEAs in the state with schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard. Most of the schools identified for program improvement had as their sole desired outcome their aggregate achievement objective.

Raising the standard will be addressed at the Spring meeting of the Committee of Practitioners at which two-year data will be reviewed. The Colorado Department of Education and the Committee of Practitioners will consider raising the standard to 2 or 3 NCEs.

Approximately 95% of Colorado's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: orientation meetings for principals and staff of newly-identified schools; assistance to LEAs to identify program improvement resources including people, materials, research, and exemplary programs; arranging Chapter 1 TAC services for LEAs; and promoting the linkage of a variety of resources to mobilize an all-school team approach to program improvement.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has set an upbeat tone of "challenge and opportunity" rather than blame in all meetings, workshops, and written communications about program improvement. SEA efforts include: promoting the concept that the educational achievement of disadvantaged children is the responsibility of the entire school, not just Chapter 1, and that it is an ideal opportunity to mobilize a team approach to total school improvement; introducing members of the Committee of Practitioners members whenever possible at meetings and asking principals and teachers from program improvement schools to describe their experiences with school identification and plan development as part of meeting or workshop agendas; using cross-district workshops on program improvement to enable participants to see that they are not the only ones in program improvement, but are part of a community of improvers; and encouraging schools identified for program improvement to tie their plans closely to the annual school improvement plan required for every school under the Colorado School Finance Act.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Colorado Department of Education would undertake the following activities: provide mini-grants to an increasing number of schools identified for program improvement; hire a part-time consultant to coordinate program improvement activities and provide direct instructional services to schools in Phases 1 and 2 of program improvement; reinstitute a year-long series of cross-district program improvement workshops for newly identified schools that include follow-up sessions during the implementation year; and strengthen the networking among program improvement schools.

While very enthusiastic about program improvement, the Colorado State Department of Education is critical of the federal restriction on use of program improvement funds for administering program improvement activities at the state level. Approximately 10% of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. Chapter 1 activities which have been cut-back as the result of increased attention devoted to program improvement, include on-site reviews, visits to local programs, and presentations for meetings, workshops and conferences.

Narrative on Chapter 1 Program Improvement at the Centennial Elementary School, Harrison School District #2

When Centennial was identified for program improvement, a school committee composed of the principal, Chapter 1 teachers and aides, regular classroom teachers, a Learning Center teacher, a school librarian, the Chapter 1 coordinator, and a parent met several times to develop their school improvement plan. This process began with collecting data, identifying program strengths, and listing the perceived needs for change. These meetings helped the non-Chapter 1 staff to better understand the Chapter 1 program and to increase its visibility schoolwide.

One of the perceived needs was to increase parent commitment to helping their children at home. Workshops for parents were held during the year to help parents understand the importance of reading to their children and calling their children's attention to print at every opportunity. Program improvement funds were used for a Chapter 1 library of high interest, and easy-to-read books for home reading. Parent-teacher conferences were scheduled on a quarterly basis with a portion of the time devoted to suggestions for home activities. Linking of community resources became a part of the plan when senior citizens from two nursing homes were enlisted to come to school and listen to the children read on a regular basis. In addition, a "mentoring program" was begun whereby each staff member, along with community college and business representatives, "adopted" a Chapter 1 child to work with and provide extra attention and encouragement. Use of public libraries by Chapter 1 families was also encouraged.

Another need that was addressed centered around the scheduling of Chapter 1 classes and activities as well as the rotation of school assemblies in order to effect more Chapter 1 time-on-task throughout the year. As a result, Chapter 1 classes were added to the school's

"master schedule" along with special education, music, physical education. An effort was made to rotate assemblies so that the same classes don't always miss Chapter 1 because of assembly attendance. In addition, guidelines and expectations were set for classroom teachers concerning getting students to Chapter 1 daily and on time, and coordinating information about student absences.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. SEA efforts to foster collaboration include: providing lists of Chapter 1 program improvement schools to field representatives who work directly with LEAs so that they may inquire about and support program improvement; promoting the use of the School Effectiveness Unit for staff development for purposes related to school improvement plans (several LEAs have taken up these suggestions); use of an early childhood education coordinating group composed of staff from Chapter 1, Migrant Education, Chapter 2, Bilingual Education, Special Education, and the Colorado Preschool Project which is working with seven pilot districts to coordinate early childhood programs; and work with the state library staff to encourage outreach programs to Chapter 1 families, as well as promoting the use of public libraries and their summer reading program by Chapter 1 children.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 program improvement has put "teeth" in the coordination requirements so that there is more dialogue between Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers, more sharing of ideas and strategies on how to best meet the needs of Chapter 1 children, and more curriculum coordination such as planning thematic units together. Administering achievement tests has been taken more seriously with greater attention to test selection, assuring that classroom conditions are conducive to test taking, and reporting results accurately. Non-Chapter 1 staff have a greater receptivity to parent involvement and the importance of parents working with their children at home. A greater use of public libraries and local book mobiles has been stimulated by efforts to maintain reading habits over the summer. The SEA also sees more adoption of successful Chapter 1 teaching strategies by regular classroom teachers and a generally more positive view of Chapter 1 schoolwide because of greater coordination.

Use of the 5% Option

In Colorado, no Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The Colorado Department of Education attributes this largely to the allowance of innovation activities under the "regular" part of Chapter 1. Also, the

term "innovation", as defined by statute, does not allow some LEAs to engage in the innovative programming of their choice.

Hyde Park Elementary Schoolwide Project, School District Pueblo 60

At Hyde Park Elementary, one of two schoolwide projects in Colorado, there has been a shift to prevention and support within the regular classroom and away from remediation through failure. A team approach to teaching with longer time blocks (and fewer interruptions), an integrated curriculum, and more collaboration and communication between staff members has focused the entire staff on the needs of disadvantaged children. The school was reorganized to accommodate groups of children in grades K-1 (Pioneers), 2-3 (Explorers), and 4-5 (Trail Blazers). A rotating schedule for staff development allows every staff member to participate with a minimum of disruption for the children. The school counselor works with several parent groups to increase their level of comfort in the schools as well as to encourage their support at home with educational activities. A system of placing telephone calls to parents on a regular basis by the teachers was instituted to apprise parents of school lessons and to send complimentary messages about children's progress as appropriate.

In summary, this school focused on three factors to improve Chapter 1 children's achievement: Parent-community involvement, increased individual attention for each Chapter 1 child with more reading time on task both at home and at school, and better coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular classroom programs.

CONNECTICUT

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Connecticut there were 42 schools in 16 districts in program improvement in 1989-90, 14 continuing schools and 30 new schools in 1991, bringing the total to 44 schools in 20 districts in 1990-91. Twenty-eight schools improved performance enough to exit program improvement after their first year. No schools have yet required joint SEA/LEA improvement plans. The potential for joint plans in 1991-92 is 14 schools in seven districts.

The standard for improvement in Connecticut is a positive NCE gain and failure to meet an optional other desired outcome. The SEA also seeks to establish an additional minimum standard based on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT). The Committee of Practitioners (COP) has requested that two years of data first be collected using the federal minimum standard of an NCE gain greater than zero. The COP continues to resist using a CMT standard, but now may be open to an increased aggregate NCE standard and/or a required other desired outcome.

The Connecticut State Department of Education has provided on-site technical assistance, and workshops and assistance by telephone in the following areas: objective setting; data collection, aggregation, disaggregation and analysis; planning for program improvement; implementing program improvement plans; and use of program improvement funds. In addition, six districts with nine schools have been included in the Connecticut Effective Schools Program and have received additional grants under "Chapter 2 Schoolwide Program Improvement".

In all interactions with school districts, every attempt is made to minimize the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for improvement. This has met with mixed results so far. However, those districts and schools with positive attitudes and "success stories" are invited to spread the word at workshops, conferences, and informal communications with other schools and districts.

Approximately 30-40 percent of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to program improvement. With a caseload of 40 school districts, each consultant has approximately 10 to 15 schools in various stages of program improvement.

As a result of increased attention devoted to program improvement, the Connecticut State Department of Education has been forced to cut back on Chapter 1 curriculum workshops and conferences, parent involvement activities, and technical workshops on applications, and comparability. Program compliance reviews now take place only once every four years, instead of once every three years, regardless of district size.

Federal restrictions requiring the agreement of school level staff and parents of participating children in the proposed expenditures of funds preclude all SEA-level expenditures of program improvement funds. Thus, the Department finds itself with surplus program improvement funds for which the LEAs have not applied. Also, the SEA finds extreme demands on state administration staff time for technical assistance related to program improvement, for which the SEA is unable to use program improvement funds. Limited state administrative funds and current state hiring procedures preclude hiring consultants with administrative funds in anticipation of reimbursement with program improvement funds.

Additional state assistance is crucial to the success of this endeavor in the areas of: identification of projects in need of program improvement; data disaggregation and analysis; program improvement planning and implementation; and staff development. Further, program improvement cannot be limited solely to Chapter 1 programs. In many instances the regular curriculum and instruction must be changed, and in some cases total school restructuring is necessary.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at the Hill Central Elementary School, New Haven

Hill Central was identified for program improvement based on 1988-89 test data. During 1989-90 this school was involved in the first year of a district-wide switch from pull-out remedial programming to an in-class electronic textbook program for grades two through five. Subject areas covered are reading/language arts and mathematics.

The program was fully implemented in 1990-91 along with a system-wide Social Development Project which has as its three key goals: teaching students social competencies; providing opportunities for students to apply their new skills; and involving parents and teachers in creating a positive social climate.

The Chapter 1 program improvement in this school meshes with and expands new comprehensive school plans, based on effective schools research that all the city schools are required to prepare. These plans are a central feature of the district push toward school-based management. The school is included in Chapter 2 Schoolwide Program Improvement which helps support an arts magnet school in the district, a collaborative venture with a university, a foreign language center, and other innovative programs. The intent is to attract suburban students whose families might otherwise keep them out of the district.

Chapter 1 program improvement funds have been used for intensive staff training and the purchase of instructional materials. Using the effective schools research, school staff have developed inservice designs around their particular Chapter 1 program needs. Creative ways of introducing basic and advanced skills have been designed as a direct result of program improvement, e.g., using a science museum within the state to train teachers to apply reading skills, critical thinking skills and mathematics skills through science instruction.

District administrators see the development of comprehensive plans, Chapter 1 program improvement, and Chapter 2 Schoolwide Program Improvement as contributing insights to each other. Needs assessments for Chapter 1 may yield information to framers of the comprehensive school plan and also contribute relevant and systematically assembled information on compensatory education needs for the school undergoing school effectiveness training.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. Chapter 1 administrative staff and evaluation/assessment staff have worked together closely in establishing state policies and procedures and in providing workshops and technical assistance to LEAs. Every attempt is being made to coordinate federal evaluation requirements with state mastery test needs. So far, this effort has been met with considerable delays in approval at the federal level.

Curriculum specialists in mathematics and reading/language arts provide frequent assistance and specialized workshops to local Chapter 1 staff. In addition, Chapter 1 staff are encouraged to attend the statewide reading and mathematics conferences.

The majority of early childhood programs are currently funded by Chapter 1. One Chapter 1 administrative staff member is currently assigned to a coordinated early childhood initiative. Also, the Chapter 1 Unit has been working collaboratively with bilingual education staff for over one year and has just begun such a collaboration with special education staff.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Connecticut's Priority School District program, now in its seventh year, focuses on the 12 educationally and economically neediest districts in the state. There is some overlap with schools identified for program improvement under Chapter 1, though not as much as the SEA would like. Priority School Districts are selected on Connecticut Mastery Test standards and Chapter 1 schools are selected on norm referenced test aggregate gain scores. Due to federal evaluation requirements and COP discouragement to adopt a higher standard, the SEA is limited in its ability to leverage truly needed changes in the most needy schools in curriculum, instruction in regular education, and/or school restructuring through Chapter 1. Therefore, the SEA has continued its efforts in Priority School Districts, Effective Schools and Chapter 2. The SEA has targeted its State Compensatory Education Program next year to the 20 neediest districts in the state whereas in previous years all districts qualified.

Use of the 5% Option

No LEAs in Connecticut are choosing the option to use 5% of their Chapter 1 grant for innovation. The SEA attributes this to restrictions on the use of funds to a few limited options, most of which are available under current Chapter 1 regulations. LEAs see no need to write a separate project description, requiring additional paper work, and evaluation. If the federal government truly wishes to encourage innovation, current restrictions on the 5% option should be waived for a period of at least three years to allow a district to experiment and to determine if different service delivery models and curriculum innovations can work.

IDAHO

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Idaho, there are 56 schools engaged in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in Idaho is a minimum gain of zero NCEs. However, the SEA is currently considering raising the standard and is formulating a reasonable combination of indicators which take into account the "preponderance of evidence" rather than NCE scores alone. Some of the alternatives include: using LEA standards established in their applications; identifying all schools to develop program improvement plans (PIP) on a three-year cycle; adding other desired outcomes to be measured as triggers; and using the school assessment and accountability measures rather than the Chapter 1 score alone.

Approximately 90% of program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: at least three Program Improvement Workshops per year, on-site assistance, telephone conferences, assignment of a state Chapter 1 consultant as a liaison, review of Committee of Practitioners plans to make recommendations, and follow-up status reports identifying technical assistance needs.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has taken care to emphasize the opportunity rather than the punitive aspect of the program. The SEA sponsors special administrators' briefings with presentations by the Committee of Practitioners. It also showcases testimonies of successful PIPs, provides support for LEA improvement efforts, and gives LEAs an opportunity to appeal their identification if they have alternative data and evidence which indicates their program is successful.

While vigorously moving ahead with program improvement, the SEA is critical of federal regulations which hamper potentially beneficial statewide activities. The SEA believes there are some common staff development and inservice needs that could be handled on a statewide basis, but the requirement that it be approved at the local level makes that impractical. For instance, collaboration models, early intervention strategies, the restructuring of middle schools, and high school transition programs could be organized more effectively and efficiently at the state level rather than mandating several small grants to address these large issues.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Idaho Department of Education would undertake many of the activities previously described, as well as provide long-term training in collaborative strategies and distance learning for student courses and teacher inservice.

Approximately 15-20% of state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement--a result of which as been a cutback in technical assistance to other schools not in program improvement.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Upriver Elementary and St. Maries Middle School, St. Maries

The Chapter 1 program at these two schools had a rather traditional pull-out program which emphasized skills. Following their identification for program improvement, the schools questioned their identification, and appealed the process, but were eventually denied after they failed to provide sufficient evidence that the program was succeeding.

Both schools sent teams made up of building principal, regular classroom staff, and Chapter 1 staff to the program improvement workshop. After choosing to focus on increasing academic learning time through in-class cooperative learning and parent involvement in homework and study skills, they participated in extensive training as a whole school.

Both schools are experiencing success with the new approach. In a follow-up status report disseminated by the SEA, the schools were asked the results of their program improvement efforts and St. Maries responded with the following comments: District administrators and teachers are more aware of and involved in accomplishing Chapter 1 goals; regular classroom teachers are pursuing parent involvement and have better defined Chapter 1 teaching strategies based on classroom curriculum; there is an increase in use of cooperative learning strategies and Cooperative Integrated Reading Comprehension (CIRC); and there is more time-on-task in the regular classroom.

1988-89 tests to 1989-90 tests: Upriver reading comprehension up 2.6 NCE; Mid School reading up 5.0 NCE; math computation up 1.6 NCE; and math up 0.4 NCE.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from all areas who worked together to develop a more holistic approach to educating at-risk students. The SEA refers those LEAs in program improvement to curriculum specialists and often provides joint inservice training. The Chapter 1 staff is working together with special education, migrant, and bilingual staff this year to sponsor a Special Collaborative School Project, which is attempting to promote a team approach in schools for addressing the problems of special needs students. The SEA is also undertaking a project with the

Chapter 1 Instructional Division to deliver a comprehensive Early Intervention/Whole Language training for grades K-3.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

LEAs often report to the SEA that the team approach to improvement has fostered an atmosphere of greater cooperation in their schools. Chapter 1 program improvement has been the catalyst for many LEA changes, inservices, and building level restructuring, and has exposed many small LEAs to new ideas.

Use of the 5% Option

In Idaho, no Chapter 1 schools are making use of the 5% grant for innovation. According to the SEA, many schools are using Chapter 1 money to train teams of teachers in cooperative and collaborative strategies, but have classified such activities under the regular Chapter 1 program. The SEA plans to emphasize the innovation grant in the future.

Schoolwide Project at Overland Elementary School, Burley

With the opportunity to implement a schoolwide Chapter 1 project, Overland Elementary School in Burley has upgraded its system from that of a traditional primary school to one in which cooperative learning teams meet with teachers who have subject area specialties. Groups are heterogeneous and flexible, with lessons focusing on predetermined goals. Prior to implementing the cooperative learning mode, training was conducted for the entire staff in the Utah System Approach to Individualized Learning (USAIL), learning styles, manipulative math and science, and oral language development.

Student progress is monitored carefully in bi-weekly meetings where staff use the time to revise and plan. While the staff was the nucleus for change in the school, they understand that the program is dynamic and are responsive to refining specific components when the need arises. Participation of a team of teachers from the school in the Collaborative Schools Project has supported and fostered the staff development necessary for effective restructuring.

Parents have been involved in shaping the program since its inception. Effective parenting classes have been provided, and input has been solicited on a regular basis from patrons, students, and teachers. The community is excited and supportive of the program, and there have been instances where parents within the district petitioned to allow their children to attend the school.

ILLINOIS

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

There are currently 350 schools in the Illinois Chapter 1 program improvement process. In September of 1991, it is anticipated that approximately 192 schools will begin joint plans.

The standards set in Illinois were some of the highest set in the nation. Under the current minimum statewide standard, LEAs and schools are targeted for program improvement if achievement falls into one of the following categories:

1) the gain in aggregate performance is zero or less NCEs for participating children in an individual school building between annual testing dates;

2) using individual student data, the individual student results show zero or less NCE gains for 25% or more of the participating children between annual testing dates; or

3) the aggregate scores by grade level in individual school building show zero or less NCE gains for participating children in more than one-third of the grade levels between annual testing dates.

Approximately 30% of the LEAs identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard. It is estimated that approximately 45% of the schools that are identified for program improvement had as their sole desired outcome their aggregate achievement objective.

Approximately 75% of program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. The Illinois SEA plays a very active role in the program improvement process. Each of the 18 Educational Service Centers (ESC) has one staff person who provides consultant services to the identified schools within their region. This individual also provides assistance in planning, inservice training, curriculum development, and serves as a liaison to the SEA administration.

SEA staff also provide assistance and training to LEAs and the ESC on programmatic concerns. Since current funding is not at a level to provide for more Educational Service Center time, Service Center staff provide this assistance in addition to other duties. For those schools which have been identified for program improvement, regional workshops are conducted by the SEA staff with the assistance of the Regional Technical Assistance Center.

It is the belief of the Illinois SEA that Chapter 1 program improvement benefits even the best projects and should not be considered as a type of punishment. To back this up, the SEA staff has gone to extreme lengths to provide assistance to the LEAs. Introductory

workshops are being held to introduce all districts to Chapter 1 program improvement, as well as workshops and seminars on topics related to the latest research on effective schools. According to the SEA, no schools have viewed the program improvement process as the state pressuring the district; rather, each school district appreciates the attention and assistance provided.

At the present time, approximately 40 percent of staff time is devoted to Chapter 1 program improvement. This commitment, however, has not hampered Chapter 1 administrative activities as the program improvement efforts have been coordinated with activities such as monitoring and staff development. As a result, the monitoring of districts is driven by program quality issues and technical assistance.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Illinois State Board of education would undertake the following activities: expansion of the services offered by the ESCs to provide more individual school visits and consultations; additional seminars on program improvement for LEAs; and the contribution of additional resources for the LEAs are financially unable to implement major changes.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Longfellow Elementary School

The following information is taken from a Program Improvement Plan submitted by Longfellow Elementary School in the Peoria School District. The school is receiving a $750 mini-grant and services from the ESC.

Longfellow described its program needs as: improvement of test scores of Chapter 1 students; development of better coordination between classroom and Chapter 1 instruction; need for greater emphasis on conceptual approach, real life skills, and long-term learning; and improvement of the Chapter 1 math program for all students.

The program objectives of the school include: identifying the needs of Chapter 1 students which are not being met; examining other educational programs that work; utilizing the services of the ESC; inservicing teachers in instructional materials, curriculum, and strategies; implementing a plan which will produce positive NCE scores for every Chapter 1 child; and increasing communication and coordination among Chapter 1 teachers, regular teachers, administrators and parents.

In order to meet these objectives, meetings were held after school for the purpose of establishing goals and a program model, and teachers were given the release time to plan and implement the program. Parental involvement was also highlighted as parents gained ownership by assisting in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the Chapter 1 program. The staff also maintains meaningful contacts and receives continual feedback from parents.

During the implementation of their plan, Longfellow used resources provided by the ESCs along with those already available in their district. They also used awareness material and demonstration diskettes for investigating educational programs that work.

The outcomes of the program have been encouraging. Program weaknesses were resolved, materials and strategies were introduced and implemented, and parent support and teacher attitude were positive. Teachers and parents responded positively to surveys on whether needs of students were being met and the students experienced gains on standardized tests used in Chapter 1, the Illinois Goals Assessment Program, and the District ITBS.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

The Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered many collaborative efforts between SEA staff. For example, early childhood staff has prepared materials for use in Chapter 1 programs and provided inservice of staff on assessment. Workshops and training programs planned for Chapter 1 program improvement are attended and planned in collaboration with curriculum development staff. Regular education teachers that have Chapter 1 students are invited to attend program improvement workshops. Bilingual education provides information and data to assist in serving LEP students.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Because Illinois has devoted an enormous amount of time and effort since 1988 to train and provide inservice for Chapter 1 staff, the Chapter 1 program has become a leader within schools and school districts. As part of this role, Chapter 1 staff, who are knowledgeable in the most current research and effective practices, are encouraged to collaborate with regular program staff so that these productive teaching practices might be incorporated within the school's regular curriculum. The Chapter 1 program also supports such educational initiatives and programs as Reading Recovery, Accelerated Schools, and Essential Schools.

Use of the 5% Option

In Illinois approximately 5% of Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use their grant for innovation. This figure, however, is an estimation because districts do not identify which programs are innovative. An example of these innovation activities is providing services to eligible children transferring to ineligible schools. There are two possible reasons why more LEAs are not taking advantage of the 5% option. First, the 5% innovation option is not clear, and the LEAs do not see it as special. Also, most do not have adequate funds to allow them to do innovative programs.

Schoolwide Projects

Illinois has 13 schoolwide programs which are located in six school districts across the state. Successful models of Chapter 1 schoolwide projects are the three schools following the Accelerated School-Model.

These schools are members of the Illinois Accelerated Schools Network and are using building Chapter 1 funds to completely restructure the schools. These schools embrace the eight principles of Accelerated Schools which include: school based governance, goals (school vision), pupil and school assessment, curriculum, community resources, parental participation (training), and extended daily sessions. With the assistance of the Accelerated Network sponsored by the Illinois State Board of Education, these schools are experiencing excellent gains and student success.

Another example of the productive use of Chapter 1 funds in schoolwide projects is a building which has adopted the Montessori program and completely reorganized using the Montessori approach. The district believes that the Montessori program has greatly improved teacher skills and caused significant student gains.

INDIANA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Indiana, during the 1990-91 school year, there are 333 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state is as follows: 1) a weighted gain of 1 or higher in basic skills in grades 2-12; 2) a weighted gain of 1 or higher in advanced skills in grades 2-12; and 3) the LEA's criteria for substantial progress toward meeting the desired outcomes as stated in the Chapter 1 application in grades pre-kindergarten through grade 12. In addition to desired outcomes in terms of NCE gains for grades 2-12, districts must establish at least one non-NCE related desired outcome for these grade levels as well as a separate desired outcome for pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade.

The SEA encourages LEAs to set high standards for Chapter 1 students. The Committee of Practitioners has actively pushed for high standards for Chapter 1 programs. However, less than 20% of Indiana's LEAs have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum of a weighted gain of 1 NCE in basic and advanced skills.

In Indiana, Chapter 1 program improvement is a commitment to effective educational practices. This commitment is led in each school by a Program Improvement Planning (PIP) Team composed of a building administrator, classroom teacher, Chapter 1 staff member, and the parent of a current Chapter 1 student. In working through the program improvement process, this team examines what is good about the existing program and identifies those changes which will increase the impact of the Chapter 1 program. The plan developed by this team helps to assure that Chapter 1 students achieve the program's goals. All PIP Team members share responsibility in the process.

In order to reduce the negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the Indiana Department of Education has consistently explained program improvement as an opportunity to re-examine current practices and revise programs to better meet the needs of the children served. All districts were advised of program improvement requirements and surveyed to ascertain their expectations of the SEA. Districts were asked to specify resources needed to assist them in this process. Responding to those requests, the SEA developed and implemented regional PIP Institutes and Workshops. The SEA asked districts to consider using a four-step process to help them develop their building-level program improvement plans. The SEA developed and disseminated a Program Improvement Planning Guide (handbook) to assist districts in implementing this comprehensive process. The Department has also relied on the advice offered by the Committee of Practitioners, which is routinely incorporated into SEA plans.

Although approximately 95% of program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants, the Indiana Department of Education devotes substantial and increasing resources and commitment--about 25% of Chapter 1 state administration staff time--to program improvement activities. Examples of activities include: approval of the district's evaluation plan, including desired outcomes; review of prior year's evaluation results including NCEs, desired outcomes, building-level program improvement, and student program improvement; review of PIP plans and mid-year reports; tracking program improvement by district school, content area, standard, and year; on-site effectiveness/compliance monitoring; responding to requests for technical assistance; responding to on-site inservice requests; reviewing applications for funds and disseminating PIP funds through mini-grants.

The SEA sponsors regional PIP Institutes and Workshops to assist schools identified for program improvement. Six regional PIP Institutes are offered for building PIP Teams to help with the following activities: to identify their effective Chapter 1 program practices; to learn about the process of change; and to begin development of a PIP to increase the effectiveness of the overall Chapter 1 program. These institutes are designed for Year-1 Planning schools (approximately 800 participants).

In mid-year, three regional PIP Workshops are sponsored by the SEA for schools implementing program improvement plans. The workshops address the specific needs of PIP Teams in their second year of Chapter 1 program improvement. These are interactive, "hands-on" opportunities for PIP Teams to network with other PIP Teams, to share ideas, to learn more about program improvement and change, and to assess current progress toward PIP goals (approximately 300 participants).

In the Spring, an Annual Administrative Workshop is sponsored by the SEA. Participation by district PIP Teams is strongly encouraged. Nearly all 293 districts participate and over 1100 participants attend more than 60 sessions which focus on program effectiveness and compliance.

Later in the Spring, regional workshops are sponsored by the SEA for individuals responsible for Chapter 1 evaluation reports. The sessions are planned as "roll-up-your-sleeves" opportunities to ask questions and work with evaluation data (approximately 400 participants).

The SEA has developed a Program Improvement Planning Guide which provides a model that program improvement schools may use to develop a PIP. This handbook describes the development of a comprehensive plan which could be completed during an intensive one-to-two month diagnostic and planning period or could take up to one school year to complete. It prescribes a four-step process for the development of building level PIPs.

PIP Institutes and Workshops are also used to provide information about PIP reporting requirements and to explain PIP mini-grant application procedures for additional program

improvement funds.

Throughout the year the SEA provides on-going opportunities for networking and updating districts through periodic BULLETIN mailings. SEA program consultants provide continuous technical assistance via telephone, inservice and on-site monitoring activities.

With additional funds the SEA would expand assistance to program improvement schools and focus special assistance on buildings in joint program improvement.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Coulston Elementary School, Shelbyville

Schools in Chapter 1 program improvement are benefitting from use of technical assistance funds. In Indiana, program improvement funds have been allocated according to numbers and needs. However, as program improvement moves into its second year, the complexities involved in implementing change initiatives are now more apparent than last year.

Technical assistance funds themselves have not instantly produced effective Chapter 1 programs. However, the real value of technical assistance funds is to provide the PIP Team with the time and resources necessary to take a thorough look at the Chapter 1 program, to examine the "fit" between Chapter 1 and the regular school program, and to develop local support and awareness for collaborative efforts at all levels.

At Coulston, technical assistance funds have been used to provide for 1) program improvement team building/planning activities at regional workshops conducted by the SEA; 2) release time for professional development opportunities with Indiana Department of Education curriculum specialists and Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center personnel; and 3) stipends for after-school hours or Saturday program improvement planning.

The experiences of Coulston, however, support the premise that technical assistance funds alone will not bring about all the changes necessary to increase the effectiveness of the Chapter 1 program. The issues in program improvement are complex. This school's program improvement team, which is into its second year of program improvement and taking the process seriously, has dealt with numerous issues which interact with the program improvement process. These include school district and building organization; Chapter 1 program organization and curriculum; scheduling of classroom and support services within each building; and change as an uneven process which requires time and involvement of multiple players.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. The Indiana Department of Education Chapter 1 staff and special education staff worked jointly to develop a set of questions and answers to clarify problematic Chapter 1 and special education issues. The questions and answers were reviewed by the Committee of Practitioners and distributed statewide. The Chapter 1 staff have also worked closely with language minority staff to develop a set of questions and answers to clarify Chapter 1 and Limited English Proficient (LEP) issues. For the last three years, the Chapter 1 state conference has focused directly on the new law, changes in Chapter 1, and program effectiveness. Indiana Department of Education curriculum consultants in reading and math have made presentations at these conferences.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The Chapter 1 program improvement process as implemented in Indiana shares many similarities with and has proven to be complementary to the Performance Based Accreditation (PBA) process in which Indiana school districts participate. Some program improvement schools are piggybacking their program improvement and PBA efforts.

Use of the 5% Option

There are no school districts in Indiana currently taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% their grant for innovation. The Indiana Department of Education attributes this largely to the hesitancy of LEAs to explore new program options when current resources are insufficient to operate existing Chapter 1 programs. Also, the 5% funding cap is too limiting for some innovation concepts.

Schoolwide Projects

The 1990-91 school year is the second year that Indiana Chapter 1 programs have operated schoolwide projects. The projects have completed one evaluation cycle at this time, and two projects are new this year. More evaluation results are needed over time in order to determine the effectiveness of these programs.

IOWA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Iowa there are 51 schools in Chapter 1 program improvement. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in the State is a positive NCE gain. All of Iowa's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. Five Iowa program improvement schools have established aggregate achievement gains which exceed the state minimum standard.

SEA technical assistance provided to Iowa schools identified for program improvement include: on-site reviews; an SEA-developed self-assessment instrument for use by the LEA; and a two-day team institute for program assessment and development of a draft program improvement plan. Many of the fears and concerns of staff at schools identified for program improvement are alleviated by the SEA assistance.

Approximately 20% of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. As a result of increased attention to program improvement, the SEA has cut back compliance monitoring and assistance to LEAs in their planning efforts. The SEA may also have to reduce its assistance to first year program improvement schools and use the time to work with second year program improvement schools when joint SEA-LEA school plans are required.

While very enthusiastic about Chapter 1 program improvement, the Iowa Department of Education is critical of the interpretation of federal law restricting the use of program improvement funds at the SEA level. With more flexibility at the state level and additional funding, the Iowa Department of Education would be able to provide more extensive technical assistance to program improvement schools.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

Program Improvement in Rural Areas

The U.S. Department of Education, beginning with the 1990-91 school year, has given Iowa (one of three states) a grant of $70,000 to develop a model for program improvement in rural areas. The funding flows through the Rural Technical Assistance Center and will be a multi-year effort with new funding for each year. Six LEAs were identified by the SEA for this effort which has been very well received by local education agencies. The Rural Technical Assistance Center Director, the Iowa SEA, and staff at the U.S. Department of Education began planning this effort in July 1990. The following four goals were central to the objectives of the demonstration program: use an on-site school team approach to

program improvement including Chapter 1 teachers, Chapter 1 coordinators, classroom teachers, principals, and parents; recognize that change is a long-term process and requires long-term support in the form of coaching, feedback, and follow-up that is readily available, relevant and responsive to local concerns; plan technical assistance based on the teams' own assessment of their needs and their subsequent needs as they implement their school-based program improvement plans; and assist the sites in significantly improving the operation and effectiveness of Chapter 1 programs in schools identified for improvement.

The first step in the targeted assistance effort was a thorough review of the state aggregated data to identify an Area Education Agency whose buildings identified for program improvement were representative of rural Iowa schools in such characteristics as small size and one or two buildings in a district. Intermediate agencies, such as Area Education Agencies (AEAs), can assist in the coordination of program improvement efforts to rural programs through geographical clustering which helps make concentrated services more cost- and time-efficient.

The Iowa Special Initiative, named I-RISE for Iowa-Rural Improvement Special Effort, began with a two-day institute in September of 1990 for teams from the eight participating schools from an Area Education Agency located in Southeastern Iowa. As a reflection of their commitment to involve the whole school in the program improvement efforts, all eight buildings brought teams that included Chapter 1 staff, classroom teachers, and administrators. Several teams from small schools had over 50% of their school staff present at the Institute. These building-level teams conducted comprehensive needs assessments and developed draft program improvement plans which they took back for review with the rest of the building staff.

R-TAC, SEA and Area Education Agency staff reviewed these program improvement plans to identify and establish priorities and to plan technical assistance that would meet the needs of each building. After all of the teams included the need for greater parental involvement in their program improvement plans, the R-TAC provided an all-day parent involvement workshop which provided information and ideas to assist school personnel in comprehensive planning for parent involvement. The R-TAC staff also conducted building level inservice to entire school faculties on coordinating Chapter 1 and regular classroom programs and comprehension strategies. The three teams that have Chapter 1 math programs participated in an all-day workshop on using manipulatives to promote problem-solving in mathematics.

Examples of teacher and parent activities resulting from participation in the project include: release time for classroom and Chapter 1 teachers to exchange visits; the exchange of lesson plans between Chapter 1 teachers and regular teachers on a weekly basis; and the provision of home book bags with learning activities for parents to do at home with their children.

Through the implementation of this project, the Iowa Department of Education has learned the following principles about how to go about the process of improvement in rural schools:

1) The support and cooperation of the SEA and the AEA is critical. The SEA has enabled teams to participate in the inservice activities by using program improvement funds to pay for substitute teachers. These funds will also be used to pay per diem and expenses for the teachers attending the summer workshops. 2) The teams from the various buildings have a need to meet together and form a network to exchange ideas. Because of their relative isolation and exposure to only the teachers in their single elementary building, the teams enjoy sharing ideas with other teams from similar rural settings. 3) Delivery of services through this network of teams has proven to be very cost-effective. 4) Administrators and teachers both report that it is reasonable to arrange release time for inservice activities approximately once per month.

Use of the 5% Option

In Iowa, no Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The Iowa Department of Education attributes this largely to the need to use funds to serve children in the regular Chapter 1 program.

Moulton Elementary Schoolwide Project, Des Moines

At Moulton Elementary School in Des Moines, the instructional program of the schoolwide project is designed to coordinate and integrate the educational programs provided by the Chapter 1 funds, state early childhood grants, and the districts' regular program to meet the needs of all students. The project will emphasize: team teaching in an integrated language arts program of reading comprehension, writing and spelling; team teaching using a developmental math program based on the use of concrete manipulates and problem-solving strategies; flexible scheduling and grouping according to student needs; development of study skills; development of student's responsibility for their learning; student goal-setting; and improvement of student attendance.

All students will follow the district's curriculum objectives, but in a smaller teacher/student ratio and through developmentally appropriate instructional strategies. All students' progress will be monitored through a group chart listing all curriculum objectives. A student checklist and portfolio, as well as parent conferences, will be used to inform parents of the child's progress. An emphasis of Chapter 1 instructional teacher time will be at grades 3, 4 and 5 to coordinate with the additional early childhood staff for kindergarten, 1st, and 2nd grade.

A flexible schedule of groupings enables all students' needs to be met. The schedule and groupings can and may change weekly. Chapter 1 teachers are teamed with classroom teachers and develop their schedule together to meet the students' needs. Classroom and Chapter 1 teachers meet and plan weekly, and communicate daily with their team members.

KANSAS

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Kansas has 88 schools in Chapter 1 program improvement. Since the second full year of implementation is not yet complete, the State Department of Education does not yet know how many, if any, joint improvement plans will be required between local education agencies and the SEA.

The minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state is a positive NCE gain. The SEA also requires that if 50% or more of the grades in a school do not have positive gains, then an improvement plan is required. No LEAs in the state with schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard and no schools identified for program improvement had as their sole desired outcome their aggregate achievement objective.

All of the Chapter 1 program improvement funds are being used for mini-grants to LEAs. The SEA is concerned about federal restrictions which restrict the expenditure of program improvement funds for statewide assistance. The Kansas Department of Education recommends a "set-aside" that can be spent on SEA activities for program improvement without LEA consent.

Currently, the SEA devotes about 15% of its Chapter 1 administration staff time for Chapter 1 program improvement. As a result of this, the State Department of Education has been forced to cut back on-site reviews.

The SEA is currently providing program improvement technical assistance through a series of workshops, identification of successful programs, writing plans and identifying resources. In order to reduce the potential negative reaction to being identified for program improvement, the SEA has connected Chapter 1 program improvement to the state's outcomes accreditation process which also requires an annual plan for improvement based on performance for state indicators.

With recent and requested increases in funding, the Kansas State Department of Education would also be able to provide summer institutes on program improvement.

Program Improvement at Arkansas Avenue Elementary School, Wichita Unified School District, #259

Subsequent to the identification of Arkansas Avenue Elementary School for program improvement, the following ambitious plans and goals were set:

Curriculum and Program Design--Program goals and objectives will correlate with classroom instruction through the use of the Heath Reading Series and with ITBS listed objectives. Coordination with regular classroom instruction and Chapter 1 reading will pre-teach vocabulary, background information, and read stories prior to introduction in the regular classroom. Those with negative gains will receive an additional 20 minutes instruction bi-weekly. A part-time reading instructional paraprofessional will be added to the Chapter 1 Reading Lab. Summer school reading tuition grants will be available for negative gain students.

Parent and Community Involvement--Parental involvement will be encouraged through the use of school and classroom newsletters, parental inservice, opportunities for parents to volunteer in the classroom, and teacher-parent communication through direct contact, telephone calls, and individual notes. Parent involvement will also be encouraged through take-home story packets. Additional opportunities for Chapter 1 parents will be planned in conjunction with the Chapter 1 Parent Center through the assigned Parent Involvement Worker.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

The SEA is changing the accreditation process for schools to an outcomes model. Chapter 1 and SEA staff will be working together to coordinate activities and avoid unnecessary duplication.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

By emphasizing the importance of greater coordination and team responsibilities for the program, the Chapter 1 program improvement is leveraging change in regular education as well as categorical programs at the state and local level.

Use of the 5% Option

In Kansas, there are no schools currently utilizing the 5% funds for innovation. According to the SEA, there is not enough money currently available to fund innovation projects.

Schoolwide Project at the New Stanley School

The objective of New Stanley is simple--all students achieve and succeed. One hundred percent of students who exit at the end of six years will be at or above grade level. By committing whatever resources are necessary, the school district will guarantee this achievement level for all students who have attended Stanley for four or more years. An

accompanying and related objective is that all students will feel good about themselves and their involvement with New Stanley.

To accomplish these objectives, the program will be an entirely integrated approach founded on three beliefs: 1) high expectations for all students; 2) enhancement of all students self-esteem; and 3) emphasis on social and multicultural curriculum.

Extensive and continuous staff development will focus on the work of Tom Good at the University of Missouri, the effective schools research, and the work being conducted by Jeff Howard at the Efficacy Institute in Lexington, Massachusetts.

Technology will play an integral role at the school in the areas of student instruction, teacher planning, building management, and the monitoring of student achievement.

At New Stanley, the computer will be viewed as a basic tool in doing "the business of teaching." Specifically, computers are not an add-on to the instructional program, but are necessary tools in the teaching-learning process.

A networked, 24 station computer lab will be available for learning keyboarding and writing with a word processor. Each team of teachers will have twelve student computers to use as a part of instruction in the curricular areas. Software will be provided for use in the areas of problem-solving, data base management, simulation, and word processing.

Teachers will have access to computers both in the classroom and in the teacher work area. They will use computers to monitor student progress on outcomes, generate student materials, plan lessons and units, and produce communications.

KENTUCKY

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Kentucky there are 111 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The Kentucky Department of Education has undertaken joint program improvement projects with four schools. Since the inception of the program, the standard has been raised from a minimum of zero to one NCE gain.

Chapter 1 program improvement schools must complete 2 of 3 desired outcomes, one which may be their aggregate achievement measure. All schools are required to write multiple desired outcomes for each instructional area. SEA emphasis on indicators of success other than aggregate achievement tests gives the LEA and the SEA a more accurate evaluation of building-level programs.

All of Kentucky's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. Based on the needs assessment and the design of the plan, an "Action Committee" at the identified school determines how to acquire the greatest impact on the participating students with the monies available in order to achieve the levels of student performance required under objective measures and standards of the state plan.

SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes on-site consultation with building level personnel for planning of the program improvement process. Consultations include but are not limited to: identification of needs utilizing the effective schools strategies; identification of providers of technical assistance to meet identified needs; awareness training by SEA for school personnel relative to the purposes of Chapter 1 and how to coordinate the curriculum and instructional strategies to best meet the needs of educationally-deprived children; and training of building level personnel to design and implement a comprehensive parent involvement program that reinforces and enhances the school program to meet the identified needs of Chapter 1 students.

In the first year of program improvement in Kentucky there was negativism at the local level associated with the process. To deal with this, the SEA staff, especially the program improvement coordinator, held meetings with principals, regular classroom and Chapter 1 teachers, as well as assistants, superintendents, and parents to raise their level of understanding about program improvement. As understanding increased, negative associations decreased. The state is undergoing educational reform and many of the procedures for program improvement are found in the Kentucky Education Reform Act. This has also helped to relieve the negative associations between identification and improvement.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Kentucky Department of Education would expand its assistance to Chapter 1 schools. Additional funding would particularly help schools in Kentucky that need major redesigning of curriculum and retraining of professional staff.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Bunch Sixth Grade Center, Glasgow Independent School District

Bunch was identified for Chapter 1 program improvement due to its failure to achieve desired outcomes and aggregate achievement in both basic and advanced skills. The state program improvement coordinator met with the school level action committee to facilitate the planning process and present an awareness session for the participants. The Committee used the effective schools quality self-rating form found in the program improvement guide and identified three areas to address: coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular program; home-school relations; and improvement of achievement scores relative to high expectations.

Coordination is enhanced by regular and Chapter 1 teachers planning together both during planning periods and after school once a month. Dialogue is shared on a systematic, ongoing basis. A review of the curriculum is made to determine if what is being taught is what is being tested on the achievement test. Also, the Chapter 1 curriculum is adjusting so that it is an integral part of the district curriculum. Workshops relative to parent involvement are addressing the development of a systematic parent involvement home-school partnership.

Program improvement funds are being used for parent and staff training on parent involvement; substitute teachers to release the "seek" teacher to coordinate with the Chapter 1 teacher; stipends for after school planning and coordination meetings; and additional computer software to enhance existing software capacity to meet identified needs of students in basic and advanced skills. Without the program improvement funds, the school would probably not have had the opportunity to implement these activities.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has also fostered increased collaboration within the Kentucky State Department of Education. SEA Chapter 1 staff have recently undergone an intensive collaborative effort with the SEA Testing and Assessment Branch. Together they have designed a data processing package that disaggregates Chapter 1 test data into three levels (individual, building and district) as required by program improvement and other regulations. In the past, districts were forced to disaggregate data by hand. Now, if they choose, LEAs may use the data prepared at the SEA to make their final reports, which

lessens their paperwork immensely. The Chapter 1 office has also worked with the SEA testing branch to redesign answer sheets to allow the collection of sustained effects which must be used in program improvement planning. Next year, the Chapter 1 testing program will be designated as "first priority" by the testing branch. This will allow Chapter 1 test data to be processed first, thereby returning LEA data months earlier than otherwise possible.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) has its own program improvement part for schools which do not meet their expected outcome. Chapter 1 program improvement is having a positive influence in erasing the negative feelings toward overall school improvement. Chapter 1 schools already understand they have to meet certain standards or begin an improvement process. They now understand under KERA they must carry the concept over to the total school program. School districts are now taking a closer look at all federal and state funding to provide better instructional programs for their children. As a result, there is a more coordinated effort.

Use of the 5% Option

In Kentucky, no Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The Kentucky Department of Education attributes this to: hesitance by school districts to undertake new efforts until they have a better grasp of the new Kentucky Education Reform Act; lack of broad flexibility on the use of innovation funds; and lack of adequate funding for the basic program.

Schoolwide Projects

In Kentucky schoolwide projects are a vital link to comprehensive reform as mandated by the Kentucky Education Reform Act. Through school-based decision making, each of the 45 schoolwide projects in Kentucky has been designed by the principal, teachers, parents, and support personnel (working with the local Chapter 1 coordinator) to address the needs of all students while meeting the special needs of educationally-deprived children.

Multi-level/multi-age students will be taught in a setting which incorporates various instructional approaches such as cooperative learning, peer tutoring, thematic instruction, and learning centers. Schoolwide projects in these districts include blocks of time in which reading, language/writing, social studies, and science are taught in an interdisciplinary manner.

Teachers at many schoolwide projects are beginning to use ongoing performance-based assessment (as well as norm-referenced tests) to evaluate students. Classroom-based computer learning centers or computer labs serve a supporting role to reform. Thirty-four of the schoolwide projects have expanded the use of their computer-assisted instruction.

The characteristics of effective schools are evidenced in a majority of the schoolwide projects. State-funded extended school services will expand the focus of schoolwide projects.

The program improvement plan and schoolwide project plan may be one and the same. Four schools are using an integrated planning process to implement program improvement in a schoolwide project setting. These projects are using Chapter 1, program improvement, and local/state funds to provide staff development and parent training. A schoolwide project serves as a catalyst to reform by bringing all aspects of the instructional program together for a "whole school" focus.

MARYLAND

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Maryland there are 259 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. Of these, 55 were identified based on desired outcomes alone. Ten are nonpublic schools. The state has undertaken joint program improvement planning with three of these schools.

The current minimum statewide standard for Chapter 1 improvement in the State is a gain of at least 2 NCEs for reading, mathematics and language in both basic and advanced skills. The Maryland State Department of Education has raised the minimum standard from zero NCEs based on the 1989 Spring test scores to 1 NCE for 1990 and 2 NCEs for 1991. The State Board of Education is in favor of a higher standard which is yet to be set. The standard should result in a majority of students receiving Chapter 1 services reaching grade level within a specified period.

The Committee of Practitioners is in favor of a standard that assures satisfactory achievement. The Committee of Practitioners will meet in the Spring to discuss the development of more rigorous desired outcomes that are tied to Maryland's school performance and school-based initiatives statewide. Only seven schools in Maryland had aggregate achievement as their sole desired outcome.

All of Maryland's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: workshops on strategies in the targeted instructional areas; development and implementation of local school plans; collection and analysis of program improvement needs assessment and supplementary surveys; and review and assistance in revision of program improvement plans.

Most Chapter 1 SEA administrative staff members spend at least 50-70% of their time in program improvement-related activities which include: local improvement plan workshops; training central office personnel; guiding the design of local program improvement processes and products; and providing training and in-depth assistance in reading and mathematics. As the result of increased attention to program improvement, the following activities have been decreased: monitoring for program compliance at the school level; revision of documents not related to program improvement; and development of written products for compensatory education.

While strongly supportive of program improvement, the Maryland State Department of Education is critical of federal regulations which prohibit the use of program improvement money to hire state-level staff to provide program improvement services statewide unless the local agency, parents, and staff of schools that receive these services jointly agree on use

of the funds. The SEA should be able to hire staff to coordinate and/or direct statewide Chapter 1 program improvement without prior approval at local or school levels.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Maryland State Department of Education would undertake the following activities: analyze program improvement information connecting research and promising practices; participate on LEA program improvement teams upon request; observe and share exemplary practices; develop implementation plans/packet; provide additional training for school teams; and observe of school site program improvement modifications to evaluate progress.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement, St. Mary's County

In St. Mary's County the schools which have received program improvement mini-grants are still in their initial year of implementation. At Lexington Park Elementary School, instructional aides are being retrained to ask more advanced questions as they work with students to enhance reading comprehension in all subjects throughout the day. They also are trained to use manipulates in mathematics to develop more complex skills such as graph reading at the kindergarten and first grade levels. The SEA has observed only once, but anticipates that this will result in greater progress for children.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. SEA efforts to foster collaboration include: Chapter 1 staff participation in most major Department initiatives for instruction, curriculum and school performance; Chapter 1 staff participation in design teams, committees and task forces; Chapter 1 staff participation in making recommendations to the State Board of Education and especially in pointing out conflicts or issues involving Chapter 1 and the regular education program; and consideration of Chapter 1 requirements for assessment and evaluation when implementing most Department initiatives.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 program improvement is an example of the use of data-based information to drive instructional change. Maryland is currently dependent upon aggregate information from standardized tests. However, the SEA is working toward performance-based instruction and assessment. Where the Chapter 1 improvement process is successful, local educators are establishing procedures for assessing instructional effectiveness, developing strategies for improvement, and implementing them in collaboration with the regular program. Local systems are exploring low-cost and no-cost options and are focusing on identifying strategies

that maximize student learning and school success. The focus on "outcomes" through performance assessments is causing teachers to change the manner in which they deliver instruction. The focus on advanced skills is also resulting in a new look at all curriculum in terms of how curriculum helps develop a thinking student.

Use of the 5% Option

In Maryland, ten Chapter 1 school districts are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The following types of activities are being funded: continuation of services to children who received Chapter 1 services in any preceding year; training of teachers with respect to the special needs of Chapter 1 children and integration of Chapter 1 activities into regular programs; conducting programs to encourage innovative approaches to parental involvement or expansion of exemplary parent involvement programs; and assisting schools that do not show substantial progress towards meeting the desired outcomes--or a decline in the aggregate performance of children served under Chapter 1 for one school year. LEAs have given the following reasons for not exercising the 5% option: they can use carry over monies without limitation; they need the total grant for current program use; and local school projects allow for innovation.

Schoolwide Projects, Prince Georges County

Prince George's County has in place an extensive school improvement program. Schools are encouraged to make decisions which improve the quality of education for all students. Chapter 1 had been seen as separate and apart from this initiative. In developing two schoolwide projects, the system has demonstrated ways of aligning instruction and support services to better serve all students. The school organization changed to provide heterogenous groups in reading and math. This allows broad-based instruction. Extensive staff development was provided to all staff to ensure the background and skills necessary to implement approaches such as cooperative learning, developing higher order thinking skills, and emphasizing oral and written language. The schoolwide project upgraded the skills of paraprofessionals to make them more valued program personnel.

Based upon assessed needs, Langley Park extended kindergarten instruction to full-time. The schoolwide project provided additional staff to address the wider needs of Chapter 1 students in their community. The increased coordination and program congruence makes for greater success for all students and program accountability for all staff.

MASSACHUSETTS

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Massachusetts, there are 151 schools in full or partial implementation of the Chapter 1 program improvement process.

The current statewide standard for improvement in the state is a minimum gain of 1 NCE. This standard was raised in 1991 from the previous minimum of a greater than zero NCE gain.

Over 80% of program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: preparation of mini-grant applications; an SEA-sponsored workshop in curriculum development; and dissemination of information regarding the requirements of the new law. The Region 1 Technical Assistance Center (TAC) and the Rural TAC have been invaluable in assisting the Chapter 1 staff with securing, processing, and analyzing data as well as providing information to school districts via SEA-sponsored workshops.

Approximately 25% of state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement, the result of which has been a cutback in other general administration duties.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has consistently stressed the use of program funds as leverage for improvement and greater collaboration between regular and special education staff, as well as a vehicle for increasing parental involvement. This approach ameliorates the stigma that Chapter 1 is solely responsible for the lack of achievement in a specific at-risk population.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the SEA would undertake the following activities: hire a specialist to develop joint (SEA) plans; begin on-site program analysis and plan development; provide year round inservice opportunities; collaborate with existing telecommunications facilities for rural outreach staff development; and strengthen the partnership with the TACs to plan and provide a summer training institute for Chapter 1 staff.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between the SEA staff on many different levels, including the management and service delivery levels. Events such as workshops and joint presentations at conferences have also served to foster a greater sense of collaboration.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The program is leveraging improvement in the main classroom by reinforcing the concept of teaching the whole child and increasing cross-fertilization of interdisciplinary approaches. Additionally, it has combined inservice and staff development training and led regular education staff to view Chapter 1 professional staff as their peers and colleagues.

Use of the 5% Option

In Massachusetts, no Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The SEA attributes this largely to the belief that the regulations are too restrictive in interpreting what constitutes "innovation" and suggests that the word "only" be removed from the regulations.

Schoolwide Project at the Snug Harbor Community School, Quincy

At the Snug Harbor Community School in Quincy, a schoolwide project was undertaken and the following goals were set:

- Meet the unique needs of all students; ensure that educationally-deprived children are served effectively.
- Demonstrate increased performance gains using the Stanford Diagnostic Test as the standardized measurement device.
- Use state and school based tests to measure effectiveness of the schoolwide plan; establish an "at-risk" database to identify potential dropout students.
- Create a school-based organization which adapts to meet the needs of its students and community.
- Use available technology as an instructional and management tool.
- Coordinate the efforts of the school's staff improvement council, community school board, and appropriate agencies to ensure success of the schoolwide plan.

- Facilitate and support the schoolwide project's staff relative to the reading and literature initiatives for which a full-time media specialist is essential.

- Design and implement a staff development program to meet the needs of staff, students, and community.

- Implement a program to improve critical thinking, problem-solving, and decision making skills.

MICHIGAN

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Michigan 282 schools were identified for program improvement based on 1988-89 test results, and 396 were identified based on 1989-90 results. Initially, 415 schools were identified for program improvement. Of those schools, 133 closed or are no longer served by Chapter 1, or met the standard in 1989-90 and chose not to implement their plans. Of the 282 schools initially identified and currently in program improvement, 113 met the standard in 1989-90 but chose to implement their plans anyway.

The current state minimum standard for improvement is greater than zero NCE gain. Statewide, 36 LEAs have set standards which exceed the state minimum. The Michigan Department of Education is currently in the process of raising the minimum standard to greater than 1 NCE gain for 1991-92 and to greater than 2 NCEs for 1992-93. When the state plan was first developed, the Committee of Practitioners favored using the minimum standards set by law. The Committee now favors higher standards and requested that a proposed standard of 3 NCEs be sent out for field review. Based on the comments submitted by districts, the Committee believes a standard of 2 NCEs should be phased in over two years.

All of Michigan's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. Currently, approximately 15% of SEA state administration staff time is also devoted to program improvement. This commitment is expected to increase to 25% beginning in the summer of 1991 when schools are first identified for joint plans. Due to these new responsibilities, Chapter 1 monitoring has been cut back from a two-year cycle to a three-year cycle, and application review has been cut back by using a three-year application with updates instead of a one-year application.

SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: school improvement process training; achievement data analysis; reading and math inservice technical assistance focusing on advanced skills; technical assistance on coordination with the regular program; and individual consultation on the review of program design. In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has undertaken the following efforts: presented program improvement as a positive activity at all Chapter 1 conferences and workshops; related Chapter 1 program improvement requirements to statewide school improvement requirements; and related the need for a greater impact through Chapter 1 to the demographics and workplace demands of the 21st Century.

Increased funding for program improvement would be used by the Michigan Department of Education to provide larger mini-grants to LEAs which would permit LEAs to implement

more comprehensive school improvement plans. Funds are currently being used primarily for in-service, release time for coordination with the regular program and additional direct services to students.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Decker Elementary School, Walled Lakes

In one of Walled Lakes' Chapter 1 elementary schools, Chapter 1 program improvement has provided the opportunity to target the area of advanced math skills as a program in need of improvement. The first step in their plan was to survey the teachers at the Decker Elementary School to find out where they felt the math program needed enrichment. As a result of the teacher survey and consultation with the building principal, it was decided that a study of problem-solving strategies would be the appropriate starting point.

The first step was bringing in a math consultant from Oakland Intermediate School District to conduct a half-day workshop for the Chapter 1 teachers and paraprofessionals on advanced problem-solving skills.

The second step centered around a visit to the school by a math consultant for the Michigan Department of Education who spent a full day visiting one classroom at each grade level to model a math lesson using appropriate advanced math skill strategies. The SEA consultant also held a very well-attended after-school workshop for Chapter 1 personnel as a follow-up to the classroom modeling sessions. Materials were purchased with the small amount of money allocated by the SEA ($296).

The staff subsequently wrote and received a math mini-grant to expand on the concepts presented by the consultants, which resulted in a stronger emphasis on math problem-solving skills in the school.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration primarily between SEA Chapter 1 staff, the school improvement office staff, and reading and math curriculum specialists. This collaboration includes joint presentations at conferences and workshops, planning of state-sponsored inservice workshops for LEA staff, and assistance visits to individual LEAs. Collaboration also occurs with bilingual, early childhood and special education staff where there are concerns about coordination between these programs and Chapter 1.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 program improvement is resulting in a greater sense of responsibility for

educationally-deprived children on the part of regular education staff at both the state and local level. The regular program is being planned and evaluated increasingly in terms of its effectiveness for all students, with Chapter 1 students serving as a key group for accountability. The state legislature is also considering making the Chapter 1 program improvement requirements applicable to the state compensatory education program.

Use of the 5% Option

In Michigan, no Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The SEA attributes this largely to the fact that most activities under innovation are also permissible under the regular program and that LEAs have little reason to become involved in additional planning and paperwork.

Schoolwide Projects, Howe Elementary School, Detroit

Michigan Chapter 1 schoolwide projects contribute significantly to the Michigan Quality Education Package. This package is a set of educational initiatives intended to bring about improvement in the education programs of schools in Michigan. The outcome of this restructuring process will be a school environment in which all students will succeed.

As required by the Michigan initiative, school districts must establish core curriculum outcomes to be achieved by all students in the district's schools. Equal access to programs and effective instruction is imperative to helping educationally-deprived children achieve the core curriculum outcomes. In a schoolwide project, the work of Chapter 1 personnel to improve the entire environment, professional development for parental involvement activities and training, improved teaching and learning, and other special programming, combine to support student achievement of core curriculum outcomes through equal access in high-needs buildings.

The philosophy of the Howe Elementary School that undergirds the school improvement plan and shapes the Chapter 1 funded program is the belief that students must be literate in mathematics, science and technology and must be strategic and effective readers. To prepare students with the knowledge and process skills required in an advanced technological society and to nurture an interest and disposition toward science, Howe Elementary School has initiated a unique schoolwide program.

The Howe School program has at its core a schoolwide effort to incorporate science concepts and processes into language arts, mathematics and other areas of the basic curriculum. Supporting this effort is a science learning laboratory and resource center for use by staff and students. Additionally, Howe is equipped for telecommunications and is linked with the Los Angeles Schools TEAMS program (Telecommunication Education for Advances in Mathematics and Science). Students view and interact in several mathematics and science programs weekly via satellite.

Staff training is provided in several areas crucial to the schoolwide program and the science-oriented focus. Staff are trained in the methods and processes of "hands on science" in the content areas. In addition, teachers receive training and support in cooperative learning, team teaching and the essential elements of effective instruction.

Parent involvement is critical to the success of the Howe schoolwide program. As a school that has been empowered and is initiating site-based management, parent involvement in the decision making process is both necessary and required. Parents participate in structured activities such as "Parents as Partners in Reading" and workshops in mathematics, reading and special workshops to assist parents in "doing science" in the home.

The Howe Elementary Schoolwide Chapter 1 program has the potential for being a model for other schools in the district.

MISSISSIPPI

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Mississippi, there are 406 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement varies by subject and grade. In reading and language arts, the minimum standard is 1.5 NCEs for grades 2-3, 2 NCEs for grades 4-6, and 1 NCE for grades 7-12. In math, the standard is 2 NCEs for grades 2-9, and 1 NCE for grades 10-12. No LEA in the state with schools identified for program improvement has established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard and most schools identified for program improvement had desired outcomes in addition to their aggregate achievement objective.

All program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: assistance with program improvement plans, on-site visits, workshops with parents, inservice with Chapter 1 staff at the local level, and statewide and regional conferences.

Approximately 25% of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities of program improvement. As a result of this investment, some revisions were made in monitoring schedules and the Chapter 1 supervisors were given additional responsibilities in program improvement as an "add-on" to existing duties. In addition, the state is using administrative funds to meet the program requirements and has employed two persons who have program improvement as their major responsibility.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has maintained a positive approach to the program in all of its presentations. Meetings have been held with LEA administrative personnel and regional workshops have been developed around the attitude of "providing better programs for students," rather than "you have failed, therefore, improve." Providing technical assistance in all phases of program improvement has also increased the cooperative efforts of the LEAs and the SEA.

While very enthusiastic about program improvement, the SEA is critical of those federal regulations which are unclear and contradictory. According to the SEA, more clarification is needed on exactly what the "proper" use of funds actually means.

If recent and requested increases in funding and more flexibility were provided for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Mississippi SEA would offer more regional conferences using consultants with expertise in a given field. For example, when the funds were first available, a statewide needs assessment was done through five regional workshops.

The initial plan was for the state to develop specific inservice in each of the areas of need, and regional meetings would then be held for all LEAs with that particular need. Due to the inflexibility of federal regulations, the SEA was not allowed to follow that plan. Further, with more flexibility, the SEA would develop a resource center on program improvement which would be available to all LEAs.

Program Improvement at Jackson Public Schools, Jackson

Parents, teachers, and LEA representatives from identified schools met to determine how funds designated to impact educational services in each school would be used. After a review of the statutory requirements of program improvement, and a study of the general directions outlined by the SEA, the representatives broke into smaller groups to reach a final recommendation.

Using a worksheet format, each small group reported its suggested use of the funds. Since the recommendations were similar, the representatives decided to embark on a joint, cooperative effort to provide educational services for the identified schools' improvement needs.

The planning group recommended use of funds to directly impact the educational services through a joint district effort. Based on this recommendation the district will:

1) Establish a resource center to be housed at the Enochs Administrative Complex. The resource center will contain materials and other resources for parent and teacher instruction. The materials will encompass the following topics: strategies for teaching reading and mathematics, guidelines for building self-esteem, ideas for homework, and information on learning styles.

2) Hold a conference for parents, teachers and district personnel which concentrates on "Understanding the Junior High Students". A representative group from each junior high school will attend the conference along with one parent representing the sixth grade for each identified school.

The purpose of both projects is to increase parent and teacher participation and effectiveness. It is further envisioned that parent participation will increase and that teachers will develop a broader understanding of how children learn. The projects provide for continuity in setting goals and planning instruction for students at risk.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

The regular regional meetings developed for Chapter 1 program improvement have provided a forum which has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff in a number of different areas.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

There seems to be a closer correlation between state school accreditation rules and requirements and Chapter 1. Accreditation standards identify schools that are in need of improvement, and Chapter 1 program staff have been involved in a team effort to improve these schools.

Use of the 5% Option

In Mississippi, only one Chapter 1 school is taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The school is using the funds to extend services to eligible students transferring to a non-Chapter 1 school. The SEA attributes the lack of greater usage to the fact that LEAs are using other options, particularly schoolwide projects, to address the needs of students.

Schoolwide Projects in the Jefferson Davis County District

In Mississippi, there are 87 schoolwide projects in 34 LEAs. The Jefferson Davis County District operates a schoolwide project in each of its four schools. It is the mission of the school district to assure that all students have the opportunity to maximize their potential and become a contributing member of society. Their realization that more than three-fourths of the students come from socio-economically deprived homes prompted the district to look closely at the effect that this deprivation was having on all students. Further assessment of needs indicated that all students could benefit from supplemental aids and services provided through Chapter 1 funding. Within the schools which serve students in grades K-12, the population in grades 3-10 has been targeted as the area of greatest need.

It was necessary to reorganize the delivery of Chapter 1 services to meet identified needs of students. The overall goal is to improve the achievement level of students. The following objectives have been set: increase the schools' mean on the state basic skills test; increase the student scores on the norm-referenced test; provide computer-assisted instruction in basic skills; provide increased sources for remediation; establish better communication with parents; remove the stigma attached with the labeling of Chapter 1 students; and provide counseling services to students.

The Chapter 1 allocation of approximately $650,000 will be expended to reduce class sizes by employing additional teachers; provide teacher assistants in grades 3-6; provide one counselor and one lead teacher for each elementary school; operate a computer lab for remediation at each of the four schools and offer computer classes in basic skills for parents; publish a monthly parent newsletter; and enhance the basic staff development program.

The schoolwide projects are designed to provide greater flexibility within each school as the needs of students are met. It provides the vehicle for improving parent involvement and for developing a coalition of educators, parents, and business people who can join together to improve the educational level of the total community.

NEW MEXICO

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In New Mexico, 101 schools are currently involved in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state is a greater than zero NCE gain. Ten of the LEAs with schools identified for program improvement established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard. Four schools identified for program improvement had as their sole desired outcome their aggregate achievement objective.

All program improvement funds are currently being used for mini-grants to LEAs. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: helping to develop program improvement plans (outlines, suggested formats, workshops), and coordinating Technical Assistance Center and other resources to provide inservice and parent training. The TAC provides additional classes for parents, training for staff on classroom management methods, and dissemination of written material that is helpful in program design and implementation.

In order to reduce the initial negative association accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has encouraged the LEAs to emphasize to each targeted school that many buildings are identified as a result of higher local standards. The SEA also assisted LEAs in responding to media coverage by emphasizing the beneficial impact of program improvement activities on the total instructional program. With the addition of a staff member whose major responsibility will be program improvement activities, the SEA will be able to provide more support and guidance through workshops and individual consultations.

Approximately 20% of Chapter 1 staff administration time is devoted to program improvement activities. As a result of this commitment, technical assistance in other areas were cut back slightly and some public information publications were not completed. However, a new staff member has been hired, and it is anticipated that activities will return to normal levels.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the SEA envisions establishing more parent centers and providing resources for teacher/parent and other staff training in innovative research-based methodology.

Narrative on Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Dolores Gonzales Elementary School

Dolores Gonzales Elementary School in Albuquerque implemented an improvement plan during the 1990-91 school year which has had a positive impact on the performance of both

Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 children. The areas of concentration included closer coordination and collaboration between the Chapter 1 and the regular school program; enhancement of parental involvement; staff development in the area of curriculum and test-taking strategies; and the establishment of successful schoolwide curricula. The support staff and the regular school staff developed a team to monitor student achievement and concentrate on the most educationally-deprived students.

The program improvement and innovation funds which were allocated both from the SEA and LEA levels provided the resources the school needed to follow through with their plan. These resources included an additional educational assistant for the enhancement of parent involvement, and substitutes to allow teachers time for collaboration and development of test-taking strategies and curriculum revisions.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Meetings among various program personnel have taken place and coordination is benefitting both Chapter 1 and other programs. LEAs that identify schools in need of program improvement frequently discover that the Chapter 1 program is not the only area where improvement is needed, and LEAs have been compelled to analyze the regular program's activities as well. Improvement efforts have served to better coordinate all the resources to help achieve the schools' overall objectives.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 is no longer an isolated program. Chapter 1, like other federal and/or state categorical programs, is now viewed as vital to the total educational program of schools at both the LEA and SEA level.

Use of the 5% Option

In New Mexico, only two LEAs are currently taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. However, these two large LEAs receive 27% of the state's total Chapter 1 funding. Activities being funded include parent training, computer take-home projects, cross-age tutoring, a higher order thinking skills program, pre-school programs, basic skills through the arts projects, and family-oriented early childhood programs. In their applications for the 1991-92 school year, more LEAs have expressed an interest in incorporating innovative projects, though the smaller districts find it difficult to maintain present staffing with the funding they receive.

Santo Domingo Schoolwide Project

The schoolwide project at Santo Domingo School is directly linked to a comprehensive restructuring of the school's educational program. Before the implementation of the schoolwide project three years ago, the many different federal programs available to this Indian school were offered in the form of pull-outs. Students were pulled out for Chapter 1, Title V tutoring, bilingual, Johnson O'Malley 874 Add-on, and special education services. Because no single teacher took responsibility for the total educational program of the students, there was little coordination as students were pulled out of the regular classroom throughout the day.

The Chapter 1 schoolwide project changed this structure by eliminating all pull-out programs and replacing them with in-class program designs. In the case of Chapter 1, the schoolwide program provides additional staff to lower the pupil-teacher ratio in grades where test scores and assessments indicate that students have the greatest needs. This has led to more individualized instruction and an increase in achievement. Besides improvements in reading, the updated system has also cut down on absenteeism, improved self-esteem, increased parental involvement, and up-graded the skills and educational strategies of the teaching staff. Through incentive programs, positive reinforcement, and a greater degree of student success, both attendance and self-esteem noticeably improved.

Parent and staff training are important parts of the project. This includes training parents in skills that will help them help their children, and providing staff development on a monthly basis. Some of the topics that have been addressed in staff inservice workshops are: higher order thinking skills, whole language, relearning, learning and teaching styles.

The Chapter 1 schoolwide project has been the vehicle through which the Santo Domingo School has restructured and reformed its educational program.

NEW YORK

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In New York State there are 118 schools in phase 1 of the Chapter 1 program improvement process based on 1988-89 data. The 119 schools which are in phase 2 of Chapter 1 program improvement based on 1989-90 data have self-identified and submitted a plan to the New York State Education Department for implementation by September 1991.

The current minimum statewide improvement for aggregate performance in is a zero or less NCE gain. However, the State Plan states that "Public school districts in New York State are expected to establish and pursue goals for aggregate performance that represent a reasonable and respectable standard of excellence. While such standards may vary according to the uniqueness and broader goals of each individual district, they should project high expectations for achievement made possible by the additional resources of Chapter 1." The Committee of Practitioners included in the State Plan the expectation that public school districts establish and pursue goals for aggregate performance that represent a reasonable and respectable standard of excellence.

School districts are encouraged to project high expectations for achievement made possible by the additional resources of Chapter 1. More than half of the LEAs identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives exceeding the state minimum standard. Approximately 75% or 204 schools identified for program improvement used aggregate achievement objectives only as their sole desired outcome. The SEA will recommend to the Chapter 1 Committee of Practitioners at their May 1991 meeting that the minimum standard be raised in the State Plan.

Approximately 55% of program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: on-site visits to every identified school addressing planning, data analysis, staff development, goal defining, objectives, program design, needs assessment, program upgrade and grant awards; regional awareness conferences and statewide seminars; grant application assistance; discussion of the role of the building planning committees; review of realistic desired outcomes; training in the use of evaluation results in assessing student progress; and preparation of brochures, manuals, workshops on: parental involvement, delivery systems, and congruence.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA: makes the following efforts: conducts an Annual Statewide Conference for teams from identified buildings highlighting successful approaches; meets with superintendents, coordinators, and teachers; emphasizes the value of the Annual Review of Effectiveness at the Regional workshops; initiates

positive on-site visits to schools and meetings with improvement teams; highlights schools that make significant changes in programs; requires an annual district self-assessment process; and publishes and distributes resource materials on program improvement such as "Instructional Strategies," "Time Management," "Congruence," "Parent Partners," and "Teaching Partners".

Approximately 25% of state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. As a result of this commitment, technical assistance and general monitoring in districts not involved in program improvement has been cut back.

With the recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the New York State Education Department envisions providing several different types of assistance: more intensive outreach to Chapter 1 program improvement buildings; regional workshops for Chapter 1 program improvement schools on student success in the regular classroom; consultant presentations at additional regional workshops; and increased allocations of staff to provide ongoing assistance for the development and implementation of joint plans with schools.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at the Automotive High School, Brooklyn

Automotive High School is concentrating its program improvement funds on the ninth grade Chapter 1 mathematics program. In addition to continued use of a diagnostic-prescriptive remediation program for basic mathematics skills, there is greater emphasis on integrating mathematics into science and shop classes. To implement this change, the school has written lesson plans and curriculum materials to be used by teachers in these subject areas. This infusion of mathematics into other subject areas should improve the passing rate for ninth grade students taking the State's Regents Competency Test in mathematics.

To provide more resources to support the Chapter 1 mathematics program, the school is using educational paraprofessionals to improve communication with parents and to implement additional tutoring. The school is also providing additional supplementary materials for Chapter 1 mathematics students.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. The Chapter 1 staff have met monthly with staff from all subject/curriculum areas, including evaluation, early childhood and special education in order to prepare collaborative methods and materials regarding guidelines for organizing programs, program quality, record-keeping, and indicators of success. A handbook has also

been prepared describing the service available from each subject area bureau and procedures for technical visits and follow-up reporting. New York State also conducts coordinated monitoring visits with staff from the offices mentioned above.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

In many instances, the Chapter 1 program improvement effort encourages schools to review the core instructional program. Some schools have been upgrading their entire curriculum. Schools also examine other available resources and coordinate them with Chapter 1. Resource materials, collaborative planning meetings and workshops at SEA and LEA levels all focus on program congruence and success in the regular classroom programs.

Use of the 5% Option

In New York State approximately 44 local education agencies are using 5% of their grant for innovation. The types of activities that are receiving funding include: incentive payments to schools; training of Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 paid teachers on congruence; parental involvement; and continuation of services to children eligible for services in a previous year.

The New York State Education Department believes that more LEAs are not exercising the 5% option because they see it as a reduction of resources to their existing programs. Most districts need to provide their full allocations to cover salaries and benefits for direct services to eligible students.

Schoolwide Projects, New York City Public Schools

In January 1990, the New York City Schools Chancellor introduced the Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects SBM/SDM Planning Initiative to eligible elementary and secondary Chapter 1 schools. Using a school-based management/shared decision-making model, this initiative provides eligible Chapter 1 schools with the opportunity to voluntarily participate in redesigning and restructuring their entire educational programs based on their unique needs and priorities.

The schoolwide projects initiative enables the entire school community, including administrators, teachers, parents, paraprofessionals, community representatives and students, when appropriate, to assume responsibility for making and carrying out educational decisions. To strengthen instructional programs in their schools, participants work collaboratively to organize instruction, redeploy staff, and budget money.

During the 1989-90 school year, 82 schools were eligible to plan schoolwide projects, and 43 submitted approved plans for upgrading their educational programs: eight high schools, 12 junior high or middle schools, and 23 elementary schools. Currently these schools are implementing their schoolwide projects.

In October 1990, the New York City Public Schools provided a second opportunity for schools to develop a schoolwide project to meet their identified areas of need. During the current school year, 311 new schools were eligible to participate in planning schoolwide projects for implementation in September 1991. More than 90 schools accepted the invitation to participate, and will complete the planning phase this Spring.

A rigorous program of ongoing training and technical assistance was initiated during the 1989-90 school year to guide and support participating schools and districts through the schoolwide project planning and implementation process. The program includes orientation sessions, a series of training and technical assistance workshops, and on-site technical assistance focusing on understanding Chapter 1 schoolwide project requirements, needs assessment strategies, effective team building techniques, developing decision-making skills, and accessing available resources.

PS 25, Community School District, is located in the South Bronx area of New York City--one of the poorest communities in the United States. The school serves a large number of limited English proficient students. The schoolwide project in PS 25 provides a good example of a program that has been upgraded for all students, especially educationally-disadvantaged students.

The school has strengthened its basic mathematics program by infusing problem-solving into the mathematics curriculum at all grade levels, encouraging schoolwide use of manipulatives, expanding the math lab to serve all students in the school -- including special education students -- and translating materials into Spanish. This change is supported by an ongoing program of professional development for all staff members and parent training.

Reading and writing instruction for all students has been upgraded by infusing whole language throughout the school's reading program. This change, too, is supported by ongoing staff development.

Parent involvement is a key component of the schoolwide project. Parents not only participate on the school-based, management-shared, decision-making team that oversees program implementation, but are also involved in all aspects of the school community, including an after-school "homework club" that is staffed by parents and one teacher. In addition, the school offers an array of workshops and activities for parents and publishes a monthly newsletter.

NORTH DAKOTA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In North Dakota there are 32 schools undergoing Chapter 1 program improvement. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state is a minimum gain of 2 NCE. The Committee of Practitioners agreed that a state standard minimum of 2 NCEs would not be an unreasonable expectation for any school and could be raised further at a later date as schools become more familiar with the school improvement process. Six LEAs in the state with schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard. In addition, the SEA requires the establishment of other desired outcomes besides aggregate achievement tests for all program improvement schools.

All of North Dakota's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: assistance in reviewing aggregate data, assistance in project assessment, planning for program improvement on an individual basis according to needs, and providing workshops as requested. In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has taken the approach that Chapter 1 program improvement is another valuable way of looking at the effectiveness of the school program. Workshops at the annual state Chapter 1 conference are also presented to promote the positive aspects of improvement. Also, most of the schools in the state take part in the state school improvement process or the NCA school improvement process.

In 1987, the SEA hired a program coordinator to be responsible for program improvement and other Chapter 1 duties. Approximately 75% of the program coordinator's time is spent on program improvement activities. Since the implementation of program improvement, all other Chapter 1 activities continue to be performed, making schedules for monitoring and other duties very crowded and hectic.

The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction is concerned that federal restrictions requiring parents of participating children, school staff, the SEA, and the LEA to jointly agree on the provider of technical assistance to each school slows the expenditure of program improvement funds.

Recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement may allow rural schools to look at different methods and models to improve services for students. Currently, many of the Chapter 1 districts in North Dakota receive only enough Chapter 1 funds to pay the salary or part of the salary of a part-time Chapter 1 person.

Additionally, if the SEA is given funds to spend at the state level, workshops or institutes could be provided in a more timely manner to a cluster of program improvement schools.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at the Cass Valley North School, Argusville

Cass Valley North has chosen to provide the parents of Chapter 1 students with specific information and techniques to help them aid their children because the staff believes "parents lay the foundation for a child's success or failure in school".

The school has purchased professional and technical services from two local universities to provide parents with practical ways to help their children be more successful in school. The service emphasizes the following areas: building self-esteem; developing preschool readiness; encouraging learning in the home; improving study skills and critical thinking; making the transition from elementary school to junior high school; and improving communication between child, parent, and teacher.

Members of the Chapter 1 program improvement team from Cass Valley North have also participated in all of the program improvement activities provided by the SEA. As a result of their participation, the Chapter 1 goals, objectives, and school policies have been reviewed and revised. The school staff is strongly considering a combination basal and literature-based reading program schoolwide, and Chapter 1 parents now have greater involvement in the education of their children.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. North Dakota Department of Public Instruction collaboration includes discussion and communication among all program areas with Chapter 1 staff members serving on various state committees involving school accreditation, early childhood and special education.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Since the implementation of Chapter 1 program improvement, Chapter 1 has become an integral part of the state school improvement and NCA school improvement process at both the state and local level.

Use of the 5% Option

In North Dakota, one high school located on an Indian reservation is taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. Funds are being used to provide reading incentives and support peer tutoring. According to the SEA, more LEAs are not exercising the 5% option because money is needed for the basic Chapter 1 program and 5% of the grant would not be sufficient to pay teachers' salaries, benefits and supplies needed for an innovation.

Schoolwide Projects

There is one school in North Dakota, located on an Indian reservation, with a schoolwide project. Since it is also a BIA school, the reforms are closely tied to their schoolwide BIA project. It is it too soon to identify changes which have taken place.

OHIO

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Ohio, there are 377 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process.

The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state is a minimum gain of zero NCEs or a negative average score for each building. The SEA and the Committee of Practitioners, however, are considering raising the standard to a +1 or +2 NCE gain. Approximately 95% of the LEAs in the state with schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the current state minimum standard and no schools identified for program improvement had as their sole desired outcome their aggregate achievement objective. Rather, all districts are required to write three desired outcomes and are encouraged to address each of the three purposes of Chapter 1.

Approximately 100% of program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: area program improvement meetings, instructional materials, monitoring, and constant contact. The Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center has provided workshops to assist schools with annual review techniques, student improvement, parent involvement, needs assessment, disaggregating data, increasing learning time, raising expectations for student achievement, and better overall schooling for children of poverty.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has sponsored 13 area meetings for district superintendents, assistant superintendents, curriculum personnel, principals, and teachers. An individual SEA consultant is in constant touch with district personnel. Upbeat presentations are given at the SEA Chapter 1 Spring Conference and New Coordinators Meeting, and positive articles have been included in a variety of SEA publications.

Because all SEA Chapter 1 consultants are involved at some point with program improvement, the time they have devoted would be equal to one full-time employee. As a result of these added duties, some monitoring activities and inservice in other areas have been curtailed.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Ohio SEA would undertake the following activities: provide more assistance with the LEA program improvement plans; use consultants during periodic program improvement meetings; and develop better program materials and a Program Improvement Handbook for the 1991-92 school year.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement in One District

The annual assessment process and subsequent identification of schools for program improvement brought the administration and staff in one major city district to attention. District results indicated average NCE scores such as -7, -13, -19 in several schools. Chapter 1 students showed average NCE scores of -2, -4, -5 in the same schools.

The district administration and support personnel, along with the personnel of each building identified for program improvement, have taken a close look at regular classroom instruction, intervention strategies, and coordination efforts between the classroom and Chapter 1.

Although each building identified for the program has a separate plan personalized to its particular needs, every school has highlighted staff development as the key to their improvement. To build on this, a local university professor has been assigned to each school as a consultant, specifically in the area of staff development.

Although test scores are not yet available, the program has been received positively and continues to move ahead.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

An SEA At-Risk Committee has attempted to provide a framework which coordinates intervention and supplemental activities so that extra services are not being duplicated. Chapter 1 supplements the needs of educationally-disadvantaged students at the 49th percentile and below, and other agencies attempt to serve students who are not eligible for Chapter 1, or are assigned to other programs.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 is leveraging improvement in a number of different areas. More attention is being given to staff development. Educators are attending to instructional practices in the regular classroom, and an emphasis is being placed on the coordination of instruction between classroom and Chapter 1 teachers. There is an increase in recognition of the importance of Chapter 1 instruction.

Use of the 5% Option

No Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. Given the fact that available funding does not even cover all eligible children,

the SEA believes that parents and administrators would question the use of scarce resources for innovation projects.

Narrative on Schoolwide Projects

Site-based management and schoolwide projects have strong links. Just as decisions and the responsibilities that accompany those decisions belong to those at the building level, so are schoolwide projects developed and implemented. Ownership encourages pride in the process and the product. School staffs who take restructuring and reform seriously have carefully planned for student success.

Goals of the state Classroom of the Future Project and of schoolwide projects have close connections. Provisions are made for diverse learning environments, and technology is used to facilitate instructional management and enhance the learning process. Administrators and teachers make decisions at the building level and accept responsibility for accountability. Staff resources are redefined and redistributed in each building. A cooperative approach to instruction includes team teaching and flexibility, and staff development is ongoing and is a natural part of the educational process.

PENNSYLVANIA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Pennsylvania there are 560 schools participating in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state is a minimum gain of greater than zero NCEs. However, the state has a definition of substantial progress which includes two locally-developed outcome indicators and a state standard for aggregate achievement of a mean NCE gain for each grade level. Every LEA in the state uses the mean NCE gain objective which exceeds the state minimum standard. Three hundred fifty-eight schools in Pennsylvania were identified for program improvement based solely on aggregate achievement. One hundred thirty-six schools were identified for program improvement based solely on substantial progress. The Committee of Practitioners has not discouraged higher standards from being set, and is currently reviewing standardized test data with a primary purpose of recommending a statewide minimum gain of greater than zero NCE.

Approximately 70% of the program improvement money is being used in grant awards to LEAs, and 30% is being used for competitive grants to those LEAs which are doing well in program improvement. The SEA charges all state technical assistance for program improvement to its administrative budget since program improvement money is limited.

SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: on-site visits by SEA staff to every program improvement building where SEA staff meet with the school principal, Chapter 1 staff, and selected classroom teachers; SEA and school staff joint review of data by building, grade levels and for each individual student; joint review of data on desired outcomes for success in the regular program and attainment of grade level proficiency; the discussion of program changes and the funding necessary to incorporate the changes. SEA assistance is key to reducing the negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement. Approximately 50% of Chapter 1 state administration staff time is devoted to Chapter 1 program improvement. Chapter 1 activities pertaining to compliance monitoring have been cut back as a result of increased attention to program improvement.

With additional funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Pennsylvania Department of Education would provide additional funds to buildings on a competitive basis. Competitive funding has proven to foster more involvement in program improvement. Competitive funds are used for staff development, the implementation of innovative strategies, and the development of more appropriate measures in evaluating the effectiveness of Chapter 1. Increased funding would encourage more staff (other than Chapter 1 funded) to participate in program improvement.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at the Keefauver Elementary School, Gettysburg Area School District

The Keefauver Elementary School was identified for program improvement based on 1988-89 mathematics scores. Mathematics was also identified as an area of need on a district-wide assessment. The classroom teachers, Chapter 1 specialist, Chapter 1 aides and school administrators developed the program improvement plan on the basis of this assessment.

One of the specific needs identified within the mathematics program was increased instructional time. Another identified need was in the area of problem-solving skills. The school, in order to address these needs, implemented an in-class assistance program. All staff also received training in mathematics problem-solving and estimation which enabled teachers to stimulate problem-solving in the regular classroom. This resulted in more fluidity in instruction and increased instructional time.

The District also established a computer lab and provided training to all staff in the HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills) program. The HOTS program combines the use of computers with special teaching and curricular techniques to develop problem-solving strategies for the students.

Classroom teachers were involved in planning the individualized mathematics program for each Chapter 1 student. The District also established joint parent teacher conferences with the classroom teachers and Chapter 1 staff. This provided better coordination between Chapter 1 and the regular school program.

The program improvement funds were used to hire a consultant to conduct training in the areas of mathematics problem-solving and estimation. This training was provided for all classroom teachers who instruct Chapter 1 children, and Chapter 1 aides.

The program improvement plan will be evaluated by measuring students' progress on achievement tests, end of unit tests and classroom grades in mathematics.

The District also used Chapter 2 and Eisenhower math and science funds to support the program improvement effort at the Keefauver Elementary School. Chapter 2 funds were used to purchase the computers needed for the HOTS lab, and Eisenhower funds were used for additional training in mathematics.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. The Pennsylvania Department of Education has integrated the Federal Programs Division which consists of Chapter 2, Chapter 1, and Eisenhower to use all resources in the most effective way to improve Chapter 1 programs. For example, Chapter 2 and Eisenhower reallocated funds are awarded to LEAs who are implementing program improvement plans.

In addition, the Pennsylvania Association of Federal Program Coordinators (PAFPC) and the Keystone State Reading Association (KSRA) have taken on a new and collaborative effort in working with schools to develop program improvement plans.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 program improvement leverages improvement in curriculum alignment which was the thrust of the Department prior to federal legislation on program improvement. The Department continues to integrate all federal programs and align them in support of the curricula of the local school districts.

Schoolwide Projects, Lingelbach Elementary School, Philadelphia

Pennsylvania has the highest percentage of districts in the nation with schoolwide projects in operation. Of the 108 districts which are eligible, 84% have implemented projects.

One of the Philadelphia School District's schoolwide projects, located in the Lingelbach Elementary School, was recently nationally recognized as an unusually effective project. The project is designed to address the needs of all of Lingelbach's 403 students, grades kindergarten through five, and especially to support success in the regular program, grade level proficiency, and the development of basic and advanced skills for the 175 students who are educationally deprived.

The design of the educational program is a whole school Chapter 1 schoolwide projects model with total in-class delivery of services. The philosophy that virtually all children are capable of succeeding in school given appropriate supports is directed towards prevention rather than remediation. Aides provide basic reading and mathematics instruction to small groups of needy students, and the program foundation is the effective schools model. Fundamental to the Lingelbach program are high expectations, a focus on instruction, parental involvement, ongoing monitoring and recognition of student progress, and strong instructional leadership. The basic program is enriched by a variety of strategies aimed at supporting the development of basic and advanced skills both during the regular school day and during extended day activities. Staff receive training in Bloom's Taxonomy of higher

order thinking skills, whole language, and collegial teacher support. A unified language arts program furthers an integrated curriculum approach by promoting children's interests in reading, writing and verbal communications. Success is achieved by creating reasons and needs for learning through the arts. A program of intercognitive problem-solving strategies has been implemented for students with skill sessions for staff and parents. Special advanced skills programs include Latin instruction for fourth and fifth graders, after-school enrichment activities, violin lessons for kindergarten and first grade children, percussion and woodwind instrumental lessons for interested children in other grades, a choir, and a school newspaper.

Use of the 5% Option

In Pennsylvania, approximately 13 local education agencies are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. Most activities being funded relate to the teaching of higher order thinking skills. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, more LEAs are not exercising the 5% option because it provides insufficient funds the local level for implementing innovative activities.

RHODE ISLAND

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Rhode Island has 69 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. For grades 2-12, the current statewide standard for improvement is 1 NCE and other desired outcomes. For grades below 2, the standard is desired outcomes only. However, the Committee of Practitioners is interested in raising the NCE standard for the 1992-93 school year and plans to set the new standard after looking at the statewide and the national data. Further, the Committee of Practitioners has expressed an interest in differentiating NCE by grade spans and by content areas.

Twenty-one of 69 schools identified for program improvement listed their aggregate achievement objective as their sole desired outcome. No LEAs with schools identified for improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard.

Virtually all of the program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs. Approximately 40-60% of the SEA's administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. As a result of this increased attention to program improvement and increased technical assistance to several new Chapter 1 district coordinators, compliance monitoring and school reviews have been cut back.

The types of technical assistance that the SEA is currently providing the schools identified for improvement include: a September statewide administrative workshop for all Chapter 1 LEA coordinators; a November statewide program improvement workshop for district coordinators and school staff members undertaking program improvement activities; and individual visits to LEAs and schools to provide technical assistance upon request. To date, 17 of these visits have been conducted. SEA activities also have included assistance in the following areas: evaluation data analysis; use of self-assessment forms; managing and leading program improvement teams; and development of program improvement plans and grant applications. In addition, the SEA has been asked to conduct sessions about effective instructional practices for Chapter 1 students and to describe the elements of effective in-class projects.

To combat the potential negative association at the local level accompanying identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has taken care to encourage the idea that the program improvement process is a positive aspect of Chapter 1 programs. It has presented this view before district superintendents during a 1988-89 staff development seminar. For the past two years, the SEA also has invited principals of Chapter 1 identified schools to attend the annual November program improvement workshop.

One elementary principal from the West Warwick school system initially displayed the classic negative response to program improvement when he was participating in the 1990 November workshop. After he had conducted several sessions with the school staff and the district coordinator, his attitude had changed considerably. Now, he is so positive about the opportunity afforded his school to improve the instruction for Chapter 1 children who have not been successful in the school's regular classroom, he has volunteered to speak at the 1991 November meeting about his positive experience.

Federal restrictions often delay, and sometimes prohibit the expenditure of program improvement funds at the state level. The guidelines for the expenditure of program improvement funds include restrictions which limit the SEA in its long-range planning for program improvement assistance to identified schools. Specifically, the regulations require parents of participating children and the school staff to agree on the best uses of these funds and the selection of technical assistance providers.

The Rhode Island Department of Education recommends that some regulatory relief be granted to SEAs to enable them to be pro-active rather than reactive in granting assistance to qualifying schools. For example, the SEA could be allowed to reserve a portion of program improvement funds for a staff member or consultant with expertise in school and program improvement to provide direct instructional assistance to schools in a timely, efficient, and targeted manner.

With recent and requested funding increases for Chapter 1 program improvement, the SEA would expand the current level of assistance and target its efforts to more schools.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Westerly Schools

The Westerly School Department identified three elementary schools as in need of Chapter 1 program improvement based on reading projects which failed to meet the desired outcome in basic and advanced skills.

In November, the Chapter 1 district coordinator and the Chapter 1 teachers attended a state-sponsored workshop which presented a plan for districts and schools undergoing program improvement. Following this workshop, the Westerly coordinator organized school teams to review the desired outcomes and aggregate data, to conduct a self-assessment of project strengths, and weaknesses, and to set the course for improvement activities which could be readily implemented in the next school year and fully implemented the following year.

Program improvement funds were used to hire substitutes for Chapter 1 teachers so they could attend planning and staff development sessions. At the request of the school staff and the Westerly coordinator, the SEA Chapter 1 coordinator met with the staff to discuss requirements and strategies. The staff also requested a full presentation about the study: Educating the Children of Poverty: Alternatives to Conventional Wisdom.

Following these initial sessions, the school teams, central administrators, and school principals met to write the required program improvement plan in each school. A common theme which emerged was the need to improve the coordination of the Chapter 1 and regular classroom program. A more formal and intensive schedule has been arranged for the remaining months of this school year and next.

School staff will also focus on curriculum coordination to ensure that instructional philosophies and practices are congruent. Program improvement funds are needed for additional staff development and inservice sessions throughout the 1991-92 school year in the identified schools. Classroom teachers and Chapter 1 reading teachers will also receive assistance from the SEA and LEA coordinators in planning and implementing effective Chapter 1 in-class programs and instructional practices.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

The Rhode Island Department of Education has undertaken a number of activities which foster collaboration among SEA staff. These efforts have centered on the Rhode Island's Literacy and Dropout Prevention Act and its promise of assistance for schools serving low-income students as well as other high-need schools in the state. The literacy initiative includes a K-3 focus component which requires curriculum and staff development in all schools and includes the development of literacy outcomes for students in grades K-2, integration of reading, writing, speaking, listening, literature, and process writing. For each of these curriculum areas, there is a related staff development and training component conducted by the SEA and the individual school districts. This initiative is for all children and staff, including those involved in the Chapter 1 program, limited English proficient program, and special education program.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The most significant change that the program improvement mandate has realized at the local level involves the individual Chapter 1 participant and his/her success in the regular and Chapter 1 program. The expressed purposes of the Hawkins-Stafford amendment and the accountability for results has refocused the Chapter 1 program and the regular program in each school district in Rhode Island.

Use of the 5% option

There are two LEAs in Rhode Island currently taking advantage of the 5% option for innovation. In Woonsucker, the LEA is training Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 teachers and librarians to meet the special educational needs of disadvantaged children and to integrate Chapter 1 activities in the regular classroom. In Cranston, the LEA is using up to 5% of

funds to encourage involvement of community and private sector resources, including investment of fiscal resources, to meet the needs of Chapter 1 high school participants.

The SEA believes that more LEAs are not exercising the 5% option because several of the activities may be supported by Chapter 1 funds without the 5% limitation. Further, the Rhode Island LEAs typically target 80-85% of its funds to salaries and benefits, 2-5% for instructional supplies, 2-5% for evaluation/assessment mandates, 2-5% for training and conference attendance, and the remaining percentage for carryover into the next school year.

Schoolwide Project at Carl Lauro School, Providence

At the Carl Lauro School the program design is based on empirical research about effective schools and teaching practices.

The school decided that the overall goal of the restructuring efforts at the school was to create a school environment that would result in improved learning for all students. To make this happen, the school focused on the following set of subgoals and listed ways to meet them:

1. Develop a set of desired student outcomes and a vision of a restructured school.
   Set clear, high, shared expectations for students; develop a specific statement of what basic skills, thinking skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors, and ensure that all constituencies -- staff, students, and parents have a clear understanding and ownership of these goals and objective.

2. Give all students the chance to learn and contribute.
   Institute after-school programs to address individual needs; mentor/tutor all students at risk of failure; collaborate with other social services agencies to fully serve the psychosocial needs of all children; and establish home-school partnerships to reinforce the learning that takes place at school.

3. Provide ongoing development opportunities for every teacher and administrator.
   Provide time for teacher renewal, collaboration and the acquisition of new skills, understandings, and attitudes; provide high quality staff development programs for teachers and administrators; and refocus existing staff and seek additional staff to support the restructuring efforts.

4. Provide flexibility, encourage experimentation and shared decision-making.
   Develop a process to encourage shared decision-making; identify and visit schools that have conducted successful programs; and encourage risk taking and experimentation to enhance the instructional and support programs.

5. Building a coalition of parents, business and industry, institutions of higher learning, agencies and social service agencies to support the restructuring effort.
Create a coalition involving the school and the larger community; continue business/school partnerships; expand current home-school partnerships; secure grants from the federal, state, and the private sector to assist in the restructuring effort; and seek collaborative arrangements with funded programs in the region and with schools where restructuring efforts have been successful.

Using $1 million in Chapter 1 allocations, the Providence School Department has allocated these resources to Carl Lauro to:

1) Provide an integrated set of academic and support services;
2) Reduce class size to 14 students in grades 1-3 and 20 students in grades 4-6;
3) Stabilize student mobility;
4) Expand current parental and teacher involvement programs and activities;
5) Create a Parent Center to be staffed by parents of Lauro students and a parent coordinator;
6) Create a literacy computer lab for reading and writing activities, and math/science activities for all students; and
7) Conduct after school tutorial and enrichment programs for students.

SOUTH CAROLINA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In South Carolina, there are 216 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in South Carolina is a gain of at least 1 NCE. All of the program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEAs and technical assistance centers sponsored a number of activities including assistance to schools identified for program improvement, statewide workshops to help with writing plans, five regional workshops to provide individual assistance to LEAs, an Education Fair to highlight successful Chapter 1 activities, and on-site visits to LEAs experiencing problems. The SEA also shared copies of successful activities, and recommended visitation to successful projects.

In order to dispel the negative association which often accompanies the identification of schools for program improvement, SEA staff members visited schools with program improvement plans and met with principals and LEA Chapter 1 staff members to discuss the positive aspects of the changes and how they benefit children.

Approximately 10% of state staff administration time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement which has led to a reduction in Chapter 1 administrative attention to comparability and parent involvement.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the South Carolina Department of Education would provide larger mini-grants to the LEAs.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Slater Marietta Elementary School

The Chapter 1 program improvement plan provided the impetus for Slater Marietta Elementary School to evaluate the program model delivery system. As a result of this needs assessment, the school has changed the program model delivery system for the 1990-1991 school year from a pull-out laboratory program to a floating teacher model. Chapter 1 reading students now stay in their own classroom and receive reading instruction from the homeroom teacher and additional supplementary instruction from the Chapter 1 floating reading teacher each day. The School has initiated a whole language approach to the teaching of reading and writing. Chapter 1 students spend at least one-half hour daily just reading, a half hour writing, a half hour learning decoding skills and phonics, and a half hour learning reference skills. The main strategy for improving Chapter 1 student achievement in reading is to increase the student's performance in reading comprehension. The regular classroom teacher and Chapter 1 reading teacher coordinate instruction by preparing a folder for every student containing specific questions directed towards recall of detail and facts, summarization of story, selection of main ideas, cause, effect, and inference.

Regularly scheduled inservice programs are conducted by district staff for the Chapter 1 teacher to increase her knowledge base and skill in the teaching of reading. Classroom teachers and the Chapter 1 reading teacher have completed the Program for Effective Teaching (P.E.T.) training.

The additional funding for Chapter 1 program improvement has enabled the Chapter 1 reading program to purchase a variety of materials (kits and software) which address specifically the whole language approach to the teaching of reading, writing, and comprehension.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The Chapter 1 program improvement program is leveraging change in a number of different areas. The LEAs are recruiting better teachers for Chapter 1 programs and gaining greater instructional supervision from local resources. Principals are also accepting greater responsibility for the program.

Use of the 5% Option

In South Carolina, two Chapter 1 schools are currently taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovative activities which include the continuation of services to maintain progress and special school program improvement activities. The Department of Education attributes the lack of greater usage of the 5% to the fact that most of the permissible activities can be undertaken with regular Chapter 1 funds.

Schoolwide Projects, Charleston and Williamsburg Counties

In the Charleston County School District, the Success for All schoolwide project at Fraser Elementary School led to the restructuring of the school for kindergarten through grade three and a change in the instructional strategies for learning in grades four and five (i.e., cooperative learning strategies). Using cross-grade grouping for reading according to reading instructional level resulted in small instructional reading groups. Three groups were taught by the regular classroom teacher, special education teacher, and reading teacher tutors. In other words, every teacher became a reading teacher for a specified period of time each day.

One-to-one reading instruction is provided to students in the afternoons on a needs basis by the reading teacher tutors. A student receives immediate help in a specific area, returns to the classroom, and the teacher tutor then picks up another student.

Without the opportunity to plan and initiate the first schoolwide project in South Carolina, Fraser would not have been able to restructure the school according to the Success for All model.

The Williamsburg County School District Chapter 1 schoolwide projects are reforming and restructuring the school curriculum, school environment, and parent-community involvement in the schools. Staff development is being emphasized, especially in the area of "whole language" and parent conferencing. The instructor of the whole language course serves as a consultant, following up to assure that the school staff understands and uses whole language concepts in the classroom. The total staff at Greeleyville Elementary School participated in the Lee Canter Parent on Your Side workshop. The Reading Recovery Program has been implemented at each schoolwide project and is predicted to eliminate 80+% of first grade repeaters. Since repeaters play a large part in identifying the "at risk" potential dropout student, future dropouts should be decreased. Chapter 1 pull-out computer programs have been eliminated and teachers have become an integral part of the computer labs as they visit the lab with the whole class. Teacher-pupil ratios have been reduced for some grade levels. Parent involvement participation has increased by two or three hundred percent. Greeleyville school has the adult literacy program working in the computer lab, and a "Big Brother" program working though the local churches.

Williamsburg County officials report that when they look at the two schools participating in the schoolwide program they now see "school-based decision making" at its best. They further report each person in the school feels ownership in what is happening, and that they see teachers wanting to change. They also report a positive school spirit, positive teacher/parent/student attitudes, and a better community attitude toward the schools as a result of the implementation of schoolwide projects.

UTAH

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Utah has 59 schools undergoing Chapter 1 program improvement. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement in the state in one NCE gain. Twenty-two LEAs in Utah have schools identified for program improvement and eleven of these LEAs established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the minimum state standard. Seven of the fifty-nine schools in program improvement had as their sole desired outcome their aggregate achievement objective. The SEA has raised the minimum standard since the inception of the program from greater than zero NCE to a gain of at least one NCE.

The Committee of Practitioners had discouraged higher standards from being set because a number of school districts in the state have historically experienced declines in test scores from first grade through the fifth grade. Also, several schools with high concentrations of minorities or LEP students have had small NCE gains or losses.

One hundred percent of Utah's program improvement money is being used for mini-grants to LEAs. In order to provide schools identified for program improvement with assistance, the SEA hired a staff person in August 1990 from state administrative funds to spend about one-third his time on School Program Improvement (SPI) activities. Additionally, the SEA sponsors an annual state SPI conference to orient LEA staff on legal provisions and SPI processes.

Utah's approach to dealing with potentially negative reactions from schools identified as needing for improvement has been to encourage the LEAs to view SPI as an opportunity to improve services for children by using additional resources. Utah has intentionally avoided any kind of negative or punitive connotations in its work with schools and LEAs.

During the 1989-90 school year, approximately 40-50% of state administration staff time was devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. Slight cuts in the monitoring of LEAs and in program management time have been a result of this increased attention to program improvement.

There are several federal restrictions which are slowing the expenditure of program improvement funds at the state level. Federal legislation does not appear to have considered the consequences of Fall-to-Fall testing. This testing cycle slows the SPI identification process, and determinations of how SPI funds should be allocated among schools and LEAs. The limited amount of funds appropriated for Utah exacerbates this problem.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the

Utah SEA would be able to increase mini-grants to more substantial levels. Currently, Utah's grant is $90,000 with school grants typically in the $2,000 to $3,000 range. If funds doubled to $180,000, the corresponding increase in mini-grants would more adequately fund the program improvement process and should be more effective.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at the Columbia School

At Columbia School, a school program improvement (SPI) committee was formed, although the entire instructional staff was involved in the SPI decision-making process, inservice training, and in the implementation of SPI instructional activities.

Reading test scores for the school year 1989-90 in grades 2 and 5 initially showed losses. An analysis of the reading basal for these grades revealed an inadequate development of curriculum objectives and supporting instructional materials. Supplementary curriculum and instructional materials were identified and provided for staff members and the school plans to purchase another reading basal series for the coming school year.

After studying several innovative projects, the Committee decided to use consultants from the Talents Unlimited project (Mobile, Alabama) to provide inservice training. The school principal used state career ladder funds and Chapter 1 SPI funds to involve the entire instructional staff in inservice training. After an overview of the Talent Unlimited project, school personnel decided to focus on certain aspects of the model to teach more advanced skills.

Aggregate performance from Spring-to-Spring testing revealed a gain of 7.11 NCEs for school year 1989-90. Test scores the year before had a school aggregate score of -.79 NCEs.

School personnel elected to graduate from its SPI status and did not request state improvement funds for school year 1990-91. However, the faculty plans to continue implementation of other measures that have been identified and to further implement the Talents Unlimited model. District Chapter 1 innovation funds will be used for this purpose.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Collaborative SEA efforts in program improvement is evident in the work between personnel specializing in curriculum and instruction and the personnel in the State Testing Program. Utah has recently developed a State Core Testing (CRT) program that provides valuable student mastery information and has been especially useful for assessing student strengths and deficits. This data is used to modify Chapter 1 services to meet individual needs.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

In cases where the entire school staff have been involved in the SPI process, there has been extensive change over a wide spectrum of activities and programs. However, in schools where such collegial or collaborative efforts have not been as broadly based, the amount of leveraging has been reduced considerably.

Use of the 5% Option

Two districts, or only 5% of the districts in the state, have taken advantage of the 5% innovative option. However, most districts with SPI schools are using some of their basic Chapter 1 program funds to support innovative program improvement activities and the SEA predicts that more LEAs will start to use the five percent each year.

Jackson Schoolwide Project, Salt Lake City School District

The Salt Lake City School District is currently undergoing considerable restructuring. This district is moving toward site-based management and utilizes an open enrollment system which allows a very high degree of autonomy for students, school faculties and administrators.

A common complaint voiced by this and other districts has been that the proliferation of state and federal supplemental programs each with restrictive regulations, fragment the total instructional delivery system of their schools. The multiple sources of funds and total number of programs at the school level preclude the development of a collaborative, synchronized instructional service plan for students.

Jackson School in the Salt Lake City district has operated a schoolwide project during the past two years. Four other schools in the district qualify for schoolwide projects next year. District and school personnel feel that the increased flexibility of Chapter 1 schoolwide status restores to some degree the opportunity to design whole-school instructional delivery systems wherein various support and resource sub-programs and regular classrooms can function as a coordinated, collaborative school team.

VERMONT

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Of the 299 Chapter 1 schools in Vermont, 46 schools (15%) are in the program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard in Vermont has two parts: (1) a greater than zero NCE gain, and (2) at least one additional desired outcome measure for each subject area in each Chapter 1 school in every grade. Ten of the twenty-four LEAs in the state with schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard. Vermont is also strengthening the state Chapter 1 program improvement plan by requiring that all Chapter 1 schools develop and implement multi-year Chapter 1 program development plans which are linked to schoolwide restructuring efforts.

Almost all of Vermont's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: technical assistance on regulatory issues; information and training on reading and writing strategies; assistance in developing program improvement plans; and presentations to teachers and boards about the new requirements.

In order to reduce the initial negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA has altered the program name to "Program Development," involved all schools in the program development process, and emphasized the many positive aspects of the program at a recent statewide meeting.

It is estimated that 25% of the Vermont state administration staff time is devoted to Chapter 1 program improvement. This, in turn, has led to a cutback of Chapter 1 administrative activities including technical assistance on evaluation and other issues, follow-up monitoring, and statewide activities on specific topics dealing with program improvement development.

With requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Vermont Department of Education would undertake a number of activities, including establishing a resource center to disseminate program improvement materials, and training school teams on program development.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Bridport Central School

At Bridport Central School, one of the first program improvement activities undertaken was to alter the attitude of staff members toward program improvement. Initially, the staff viewed the program with resistance and defensiveness. With the introduction of inservice

training and support, teachers recognized the importance of the program as a positive, rather than negative addition.

The Chapter 1 program is overseen by a central office master teacher who arranged meetings with the principal and other teachers at the school in order to solicit their ideas for change and improvement. One of the identified weaknesses of Bridport was in the area of coordination between Chapter 1 programming and main classroom teaching. Because of its small size and rural setting, there did not seem to be enough time for coordination activities at the school.

To rectify the problem, the Improvement Plan allowed for a weekly meeting between Chapter 1 tutors and three regular classrooms. With the Chapter 1 program improvement funds, they were able to hire a substitute teacher to provide supervision while the Chapter 1 tutor and teachers met to discuss strategies, and coordinate learning activities for the Chapter 1 children. An additional benefit of these meetings was the relevance of the dialogue to other children and activities in the primary unit.

The process has been very successful in that staff members at Bridport school take pride in the gains of their students and look forward to even greater improvement in the future.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between state education staff in a number of different academic areas. These efforts include increased collaboration between the reading consultant and special education staff in the development of a recently mandated comprehensive system of instructional services (Act 230), the development of a Department early education team, and working with the portfolio program on an assessment project.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

In Vermont, Chapter 1 program improvement activities have provided an impetus to restructuring on a greater, statewide level. In addition, state goals and targets also include a number of provisions concerning Chapter 1 and program improvement.

Use of the 5% Option

In Vermont, one Chapter 1 school is using the 5% innovation money for a project involving a partnership between the community and the private sector in an alternative high school setting. According to the Vermont State Department of Education, many innovation projects can be done as part of the regular grant and, therefore, would not require any specific approval.

WASHINGTON

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Washington there are 95 schools in the program improvement process.

Beginning in the 1989-90 school year, Washington State began using national NCE standards as a trigger for program improvement. Two conditions warrant program improvement: when the average NCE gain for a subject in a building is zero or negative, and when progress is not made toward meeting the desired outcome specified in the application. Approximately 50% (142 total) of the LEAs with schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the national standards, and it is not uncommon for LEAs to set achievement goals well above 3 NCEs. LEAs are also required to evaluate progress against one or more performance-based desired outcomes.

All of Washington's program improvement money is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. In addition, SEA assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: statewide technical assistance and evaluation workshops on program improvement activities; on-site assistance and dissemination of the State Plan; guidance and informational materials for the development of school improvement plans; and collaboration with Technical Assistance Centers to provide assistance to the LEAs.

In order to reduce the potential negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for program improvement, the SEA disseminated a comprehensive packet of materials to help LEAs develop their plan, and promoted a positive attitude among state and local staff with workshops, on-site visits, and a variety of other assistance activities.

Initially, administration of the program improvement program required a minimum of at least 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. However, as the program improvement demands increased, time devoted to the program is now closer to 1.5 FTE. This, in turn, has led to a cutback on several Chapter 1 administrative activities for schools not in program improvement including: technical assistance to the LEAs; 1989-90 monitoring, which had a negative impact on the three-year review plan; collaborative activities with other programs and agencies; State Advisory Council Meetings; and timely correspondence to LEAs.

While very supportive of program improvement, the Washington Department of Education believes that federal regulations which mandate that all program improvement monies be processed through the LEAs seriously restrict the choices available to the Committee of Practitioners.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Washington State Department of Education would implement more statewide activities as recommended by the Committee of Practitioners, as well as expand the activities already underway.

Narrative on Chapter 1 Program Improvement in the Bellevue School District

The Bellevue School District provides a good example of the productive use of technical assistance funds at the local level. To begin the improvement process, the Program Improvement Plan was used to establish needs, identify resources, review strategies, and develop goals. These goals included increased parental involvement, accelerated learning by students, and the development of closer communications between the regular classroom and special programs.

The goals were then translated into action. The strengths of the Bellevue project include extensive planning, review of evaluation data, development of grade-by-grade desired outcomes, and increased inservice and staff opportunities.

Although it may be slightly premature to report the effects of program improvement technical assistance funding on the schools, communications with local agencies indicate a great deal of excitement and appreciation for the allocations which assist in the implementation of their plans.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

Use of the 5% Option

In Washington, no Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The Department of Education feels it is already implementing effective programs, and with the limited amount of available dollars under the 5%, the money is better used for other activities.

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement efforts have fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff in a number of different areas. One example is the increased collaboration between various Reading/Language Arts programs through reviews and technical assistance. State and local assessment and evaluation programs also work together to report findings, determine program needs, and provide assistance to the LEAs. A State Agency Categorical Support Services Task Force--which includes representatives from the Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Special Education, Migrant, Bilingual, Immigrant and Equity Programs studies--issues coordination and provides means by which at-risk students will have equal access to education.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

In Washington State, the process which is necessary to design program improvement plans has served to enhance communications between the LEAs, the Committee of Practitioners, and the SEA as well as promote greater collaboration between Chapter 1 and regular school programs.

Schoolwide Projects

Washington State has three schoolwide projects: Mabton, Toppenish, and Palisades. Two of the sites are new and have not completed a program cycle. All three schoolwide projects are in various stages of fostering extensive collaboration between Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 programs, parents, and staff. All sites used Chapter 1 monies to make substantial changes in school materials, curriculum, and philosophy. Inservice activities were common and administrative polices were reviewed and moderated as necessary. At one site, a massive reconstruction project was undertaken to accommodate the schoolwide programs. This site is also using an extensive computer-assisted instructional program and unique staffing pattern to accommodate an annual influx of migrant students as well as the basic population.

WEST VIRGINIA

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In West Virginia there are 203 schools in the Chapter 1 program improvement process. The current minimum statewide standard for improvement is a minimum gain of greater than zero NCEs and attainment of two out of three desired outcomes. No LEAs have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard. When the statewide evaluation system is implemented the minimum will rise to 2 NCEs.

All of the Chapter 1 program improvement money in West Virginia is being used for mini-grants to LEAs. SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for improvement includes inservice for all LEA directors and training for the entire staff of each program improvement school on dealing with local objectives, needs assessment, and developing programs to correct weaknesses.

In order to reduce the initial negative association at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for improvement, the SEA sponsors state Chapter 1 meetings for LEA directors, regional Chapter 1 meetings for Chapter 1 principals and teachers, and emphasizes the positive aspects of school improvement with a "let's fix it" attitude.

Approximately 50% of SEA Chapter 1 state administration staff time is being used for program improvement activities. About one half of that time is directly related to program improvement requirements in the regulations. As the result of increased attention to program improvement, regular visits to all schools have been cut back, regional meetings of LEA directors have been reduced, and professional development of SEA staff has decreased because of time constraints.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the West Virginia Education Department of Education would be able to provide funds and support for more school staff development in the areas of teaching advanced skills, and support more parent involvement in program improvement.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement at Roosevelt Elementary School, Wood County

Roosevelt was identified for program improvement based on the 1989-90 school year evaluation. Funds were made available to provide staff development in the area of critical thinking and for release time to allow increased coordination of programs. Although test results are not yet available, the opinion of people involved is that significant improvement has occurred. Classroom observation and review of lesson plans points to a considerable increase in the delivery of instruction related to critical thinking. In both math and reading, significant effort is being made by Chapter 1 and regular classroom teachers to expand on

reading comprehension and mathematics problem-solving. Prior to the training, teachers were much more textbook-driven and unaware of the possibilities for creative instruction. Staff development delivered over an extended period of time has proven to be effective. To be successful it must be available for all staff in the school.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

Use of the 5% Option

In West Virginia no Chapter 1 schools are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grant for innovation. The SEA attributes this largely to the lack of funds and the commitment to expanding programs in operation. Also, programs that would be developed under innovation can be provided without that designation.

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between state education staff from a number of different areas. West Virginia has two program improvement initiatives in addition to Chapter 1. The West Virginia State Department of Education is working to connect all three of the program improvement efforts. The evaluation team at the SEA is working with the Chapter 1 staff to develop statewide evaluation. Curriculum specialists are helping with staff development and program improvement.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

The SEA examined several schools identified for program improvement and discovered that the non-Chapter 1 students did not do as well as the Chapter 1 students. The Department's primary concern in program improvement is to change instruction in the entire school, not just the Chapter 1 program.

Schoolwide Projects, the Monaville Elementary School, Logan County

The basic premise of schoolwide programs in West Virginia is restructuring of the entire school. Included is a change in curriculum and instruction to reflect contemporary thought and increased time within classrooms spent on reading and math. Central to the process is staff development for the entire school staff and continuous coordination.

One example of the development of schoolwide projects is Monaville Elementary School in Logan County. Before the advent of schoolwide status, the school used a traditional text driven program with little or no community involvement. As a result of implementing the schoolwide process, the math and reading time blocks were increased by one-half hour per

day. The increased time is dedicated to reading comprehension and math applications. Class size for reading and math has been reduced in the primary grades to about 10 children. The total staff has been trained to incorporate computer-assisted instruction into their program. Over 100 parents of the school population of about 240 have been recruited as helpers within the school and as dedicated helpers at home. The parents were sufficiently pleased with the program to petition the board of education to expand its attendance area and increase the number of children that could attend the school.

WISCONSIN

CHAPTER 1 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

In Wisconsin, there are 145 schools identified for Chapter 1 program improvement for 1990-91 based on 1989-90 data. Of these, 31 are continuing efforts began in 1989-90 when they were originally identified. The state has undertaken 5 joint plans with program improvement schools.

The current minimum statewide standard for improvement is a gain of 3 NCEs in both basic and advanced skills on a standardized measurement. The SEA strongly encourages the use of other desired outcomes in the application.

Two-thirds of the LEAs in the state with schools identified for program improvement have established aggregate achievement objectives which exceed the state minimum standard of positive gain by which they were identified. However, none exceed the newly established standard of three NCE gains and only one equals it. The 1990-91 groups have not yet set their new objectives for 1991-92 in view of the three NCE standard.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has standards in place for school years 1991-1993. The SEA will retain the 3 NCE requirement for advanced and basic skills. In addition, the SEA adds a requirement for non-standardized assessment of success on LEA desired goals and objectives with the SEA defining substantial progress. The SEA encourages the establishment of other desired outcomes and permits LEAs to use selected measures to add to the profile of project effectiveness. At least 90% of the LEAs identified for program improvement had other desired outcomes besides these measures for aggregate achievement.

To some extent the Committee of Practitioners discouraged higher standards from being set. The Committee recommended the following: each individual LEA be permitted to set its standard rather than the state; LEAs be given authority to define substantial progress; and the SEA not require but encourage other desired outcomes.

All program improvement money in Wisconsin is provided to LEAs through mini-grants. Districts targeted for program improvement that do not have sufficient funds to send building teams to the induction workshop apply for a mini-grant to cover this activity. Once plans are written, LEAs apply for funds to implement selected activities that are specified in the plan. Other SEA technical assistance provided to schools identified for program improvement includes: follow-up technical assistance visits to districts and schools by a TAC representative and SEA consultant; Teacher Renewal Workshops in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics (Chapter 1 and regular district teachers who attend return to provide staff development to others on effective teacher practices); phone/letter technical assistance;

directing LEA/Building teams to other state resources; on-site cooperative planning; and establishing joint plans.

In order to reduce negative associations at the local level accompanying the identification of schools for improvement, the State Chapter 1 Director and TAC representative conducted a workshop on program improvement at the annual school boards convention. School board members and district administrators had an opportunity to discuss issues and ask questions. In multiple meetings the SEA has also put emphasis on the district responsibility for schoolwide improvement rather than just Chapter 1 improvement, so that the Chapter 1 teachers are not alienated when a building is identified. The State Director also speaks at parent workshops emphasizing the importance of their involvement in the process.

Approximately 40% of state administration staff time is devoted to the new responsibilities for Chapter 1 program improvement. As a result of increased attention devoted to program improvement, the number of LEAs receiving compliance and technical assistance on regular Chapter 1 project issues must be cut because of increased workloads for SEA consultants related to joint plans, technical assistance to identified schools, and assistance with program improvement workshops. Use of funds for program improvement activities have also cut back statewide parent leadership training and follow-up regional meetings. State Chapter 1 sponsored training now has to be provided on alternate years instead of annually.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is concerned about the lack of clarity in federal regulations on how the SEA could utilize the program improvement funds to address the need for staffing to devote full time to program improvement related activities. The Department's consultants have too little time for on-site technical assistance for joint plans and other program improvement needs.

With recent and requested increases in funding for Chapter 1 program improvement, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction would provide the following types of assistance: more in-depth leadership training for principals of buildings identified for program improvement by increasing their exposure to Robert Slavins' findings, accelerated schools, and other reforms including the effective role of the principal in the program improvement process; assistance by program improvement and assessment specialists to LEAs floundering because of disjointed curriculum and assessment efforts; a leadership training model for parents and teachers to increase understanding of their roles in promoting students' growth in achievement of advanced and basic skills; and provide instructional staff more in depth exposure to effective study skills programs and in-class room models such as cooperative learning.

Chapter 1 Program Improvement, Mineral Point Elementary School

The Mineral Point Elementary School was targeted for program improvement on the basis of its 1988-89 aggregate scores and, as a result, developed and implemented an action plan for the 1989-90 school year which focused on improvement needs in the mathematic

program component. The district requested a mini-grant of program improvement funds and was awarded a grant of $875. These funds were used to purchase math manipulatives for use in problem-solving.

A thorough analysis examined input from administrators, parents, and building team members. Building team input indicated several needs ranging from a room to teach in to curriculum coordination. Administrators specified a need for the program to be better coordinated with the regular classroom to ensure a commonality of math language as students progress through the grades. Parents identified communication-related needs.

Goals established for program improvement included: making the K-4 Chapter 1 Math program an integral part of the elementary school curriculum; increasing achievement scores in math; helping students show a positive attitude about themselves; providing for Chapter 1 staff attendance at appropriate inservices to improve program effectiveness; and fostering integral parent involvement in the program.

Mineral Point exited program improvement at the end of 1989-90. The District reported the program improvement process to be a positive experience and one helpful to district curriculum efforts. Special accomplishments were: alignment of the District Math Curriculum enablers with the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards; alteration of the instruction of Chapter 1 math classes which were determined by the item analysis of the ITBS (Iowa Test of Basic skills); utilization of more problem-solving strategies and manipulative for instruction, modeling, and guided practices and monthly dissemination of information packets to keep parents well informed. Another significant outcome noted by TAC and SEA staff during on-site consultations was that the building staff decided the self-assessment process would also be worthwhile for the reading program even though it was not identified for program improvement.

CHAPTER 1 INNOVATION

SEA Intra-Agency Collaboration

Chapter 1 program improvement has fostered increased collaboration between SEA staff from a number of different areas. SEA efforts to foster collaboration include: participation of the Chapter 1 mathematics consultant in cooperative planning and dissemination of information on national standards; involvement of state early childhood supervisor in the annual conference; training of staff development teams on new curriculum directions for reading and math; cooperative consultation in relating Chapter 1 guidelines to state mandates for special education and bilingual education; meetings between SEA standards auditors and Chapter 1 consultants; exchange of information between Chapter 1 evaluators and state test and assessment staff; and P-5 (Primary Grade 5) compensatory education state funded coordinator, state Chapter 1 coordinator, and Milwaukee coordinator jointly planning

for operation of programs in urban districts where schoolwide and P-5 efforts are part of the district school effectiveness plan.

Leveraging Improvement in the Main Classroom

Chapter 1 program improvement is leveraging change in regular education and categorical program at the local level in Wisconsin. The SEA has been told by district/CESA (Cooperative Education Service Agencies) personnel that the building analysis of Chapter 1 and the District instructional programming have resulted in improvement of practices for the entire school in programming, curriculum, instruction strategies and assessment practices.

The SEA is also seeing a greater awareness and use of the evaluation results for program planning now that the building level analysis is necessary. Prior to program improvement, many viewed the evaluation and reporting as a Chapter 1 activity to keep the SEA and the federal government satisfied. A new relevance and recognition of the value of this data is emerging for local districts and stronger school planning that is based on meeting student needs is resulting.

Program improvement has also brought principals in as genuine team members and this is an asset -- they are more aware of Chapter 1, what happens before and after Chapter 1 services, and the impact on project effectiveness and student achievement.

Use of the 5% Option

In Wisconsin twelve Chapter 1 school districts are taking advantage of the opportunity to use 5% of their grants for innovation. Activities that have been funded include staff development, parental involvement and training, intensive teacher training/problem-solving/reading strategies and a pilot program of reading recovery with partial Chapter 1 staff involvement. According to the SEA, the majority of school districts do not exercise the innovation option because they need the money to continue the regular program and cover staff salaries.

Schoolwide Projects, Milwaukee

At the present time all schoolwide projects are located within the Milwaukee Public School District. There are 13 elementary and two middle schoolwide projects. Each school in Milwaukee is required by the district to have an effective schools plan. The SEA and Milwaukee Public Schools are working toward development of a consolidated application plan, the Chapter 1 schoolwide project, and the state funded P-5 compensatory education program. This effort is attempting to avoid duplication while meeting the information needs of each program. The end goal is to have all programs work in harmony to strengthen the schools' effectiveness and to assist all children in gaining a richer learning experience than is possible when each program is run separately. Increased student achievement and more

effective parental involvement are among priorities established by the state, the Milwaukee School District, Chapter 1, and the state funded P-5 program. The assessment measures used to determine the effectiveness of each project in meeting these desired outcomes is under analysis to effect use of existing data where possible, and to avoid duplication of unnecessary testing of students while assuring each local, state, and federally funded program can meet its evaluation and reporting requirements. Eleven of the 15 schoolwide projects are also in program improvement.